9 DECEMBER 1947

INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
SHIMADA, Shigetoro (resumed)	34802
Redirect(cont'd) by Mr. Brannon	34802
Questions by the Acting President of the Tribunal, Major-General Myron C. Cramer	34816
Direct (cont'd) by Mr. Brannon	34817
(Witness excused)	34821
YATSUGI, Kazuo (recalled)	34831
Direct by Mr. Caudle	34832
(witness excused)	34837
AFTERNOON RECESS	34904
UGAKI, Issei (recalled)	34907
Direct by Mr. Caudle Direct (cont'd) by Mr. Blakeney Direct (cont'd) by Mr. Logan	34907 34912 34913
Cross by Nr. Sandusky	34914
Question by the Acting President of the Tribunal, Major-General Myron C. Cromer	34917
Question by Mr. Caudle	34917
(Witness excused)	34917

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

Doc.	Def. Pros.	Description]	For In dent.Evidence
622 - B -1	3573	Excerpt from Inter- rogation of SHIMADA, Shigetare	34820
1804	3574	Regulation Concerning POW Rations	34821
1804-A	3574-A	certificate of Source and Authenticity re the above docu- ment	
	MC	RNING RECESS	34828
62	3575	Curriculum Vitae of SHIRATORI, Toshio	34830
75	3576	Organization of the Ministry of Forei Affairs - 22 Octo 1898 - Imperial Ordinance No. 258	ber
647	3577	Affidavit of YATSUGI Kazuo	, 34834
156	3578	Certificate of Authericity re ARITA's Appointment as Ambassador to Belland transfer from there to China	gium
1929	3579	Interrogation of Eugen Ott	34848
		NOON RECESS	34858

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Doc. No.	Def. No.	Pros.	Description For Ident.	In vidence
2896	3580		Affidavit of UGAKI, Issei	34908
640	3581		Telegram sent by Ambassador SHIRATORI at Rome to Foreign Minister ARITA dated 10 January 1939	34918
275	3582		Confidential Note sent by Ambassador SHIRATORI at Rome to Foreign Minister ARITA dated 19 January 1939	34919
556	3583		Excerpts from Count Ciano's Diary (English translation)	34921
556-A) 1619-A)	3583-	A	Certificate of Origin re certain portions of the Office of Strategic Services' English trans- lation of Count Ciano's Diary	34925
852	3584		Memorandum of Mackensen, German Ambassador at Rome, dated 3 January 1939	34926

9 DECEMBER 1947

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

	Def. No.	Description Ide	r In nt.Eviden	CE
1619	3585	Excerpts from Count Ciano's Diary	34928	
1497	3586	Certificate of Authen- ticity re the copies of telegrams exchanged between the Japanese Foreign Office and SHIRATORI, Toshio, Ambassador Extraordinar and Plenipotentiary to Italy re negotiations of cerning the Tripartite Pact were destroyed by fire		

Tuesday, 9 December 1947

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST
Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan

The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930.

Appearances:

For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE SIR WILLIAM F. WEBB, Member from the Commonwealth of Australia, not sitting from 0930 to 1600; HONORABLE JUSTICE LORD PATRICK, Member from the United Kingdom of Great Britain, not sitting from 1330 to 1600.

For the Prosecution Section, same as before.
For the Defense Section, same as before.

(English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.)

Duda & Spratt

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

ACTING PRESIDENT: All the accused are

present except MATSUI, who is represented by counsel.
We have a certificate from the prison surgeon of
Sugamo certifying that he is ill and unable to attend the trial today. The certificate will be recorded
and filed.

Mr. Brannon.

SHIGETARO SHIMADA, an accused, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. BRANNON (Continued):

were on the subject of oil, Admiral. The prosecution asked you, and I quote: "Is it not true that one reason urged for making war on the United States was economic strangulation with regard to oil?" Your answer was: "That was not a fact." Will you please explain to the Tribunal exactly what you mean by that answer?

A Yesterday there were various questions from the prosecutor in connection with the relationship

1 2 3

4

6

8

7

9

11

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

just given by you was quite insufficient on my part.

To make the situation clear, I should like to explain the relationship between oil and war.

Q Admiral, please confine your answer to matters which you have not already stated.

With regard to oil, I think I have made my position clear in my affidavit, and I further testified on this matter yesterday to some extent. The situation in Japan in the latter part of November was one in which oil had -- the supply of oil had gradually and daily decreased to the point where it was weakening the national defense power of Japan. On the one hand United States military pressure against Japan was being daily intensified and presented a very serious threat to Japan. At that time telegraphic information was being received from Ambassador NOMURA in Washington with regard to United States public opinion, and we understood from Ambassador NOMURA's telegram that in September a war against Japan was much more popular in the United States than war against Germany. For instance, the Gallup poll for September indicated that seventy per cent of the people polled were in favor of war against Japan.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Now, if the Tribunal

please, if this inquiry is going to be devoted to the subject announced, namely, oil, there is no objection whatever. But the prosecution does object to this witness' using that question as a means of presenting his views on other matters.

MR. BRANNON: We quite agree with the prosecution, and I will ask you, Admiral, to confine your answer to the question of oil, omitting other matters as much as possible.

A (Continuing) Isn't the point in the question that I am not considering the question of oil very seriously?

Q Yes, the question was that is it not one of the reasons urged for making war on the United States, is not one of the reasons the economic strangulation with regard to oil, and you said, "That was not a fact." I want to ask you if that is your answer and if you want to accept that now as your answer.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: The prosecution objects to the extent that that question may be calling upon the witness to either repeat or revise his answer of yesterday.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Ask him what he meant by that answer.

BY MR. BRANNON (Continued):

6

3

4

5

9

8

11

12 13

14 15

17

16

18

20 21

· 22

23

24

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

What did you mean by that answer, Admiral?

I said yesterday that the factor which led Japan into war was not oil but the Hull note. To state it in different words, the question which was at the heart of the matter was the United States' attitude. If the United States' attitude did not favor war, and if that fact were clearly known, it was no concern of ours even if the supply of oil fell down to the point of zero. For instance, let us take the situation in which the Hull note was unacceptable, and in Japan the navy was opposed to participation in the In such a situation if the United States! attitude was that the United States did not desire nor favor war against Japan there would have been no fear or feeling of threat at all in Japan. But thereupon came the Hull note, and, under a situation which I was about to describe previously, the intensification of the American military pressure against Japan, the swinging of American public opinion in favor of war, and if under such a situation and in the light of such a situation it led us to believe that if the United States should attack Japan, under such a situation we were in a state of alarm of not knowing when the United States would or might attack This pesed a very serious threat agains us

0

20

21

23

24

which we could not ignore, and in the light of that situation we were forced into making a decision for war.

4 5

. 22

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Now, if the Court please, if a motion to strike out the answer of the witness as unresponsive to the question would be received, it certainly would be appropriate at this time. But it might serve if the Court should see fit to advise the witness to confine his answers to the questions as put. Certainly, the prosecution does object to the witness' taking this question about oil as an opportunity for him to express his views about the beginning of the war on many other points, especially as they are mere repetition of what he said yesterday and are not now subject to cross-examination.

MR. BRANNON: If the prosecution will be patient enough to let him finish his answer, I think he will connect it, if the Tribunal please.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It seems as though he has already sufficiently explained his answer.

MR. BRANNON: I believe he has a last portion of his answer he would like to give here. He was cut off in the middle, I am sure. I would like if possible to urge the Tribunal to allow the accused to fully express his views on these matters, because it is the only time that he will have the chance to speak.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: May I ask that counsel repeat the original question so that it may be clearly

34,808

seen to what extent the vitness is departing from the question asked.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Let the witness finish his answer.

A (Continuing) In other words, the question of oil which was mentioned by Captain Robinson was not the primary or principal question. It was not even one of the factors. The principal deciding factor was the United States attitude. That is how I replied yesterday.

Q All right. We will leave that subject. I want to go for a moment back to your command of the China Seas Fleet, and ask you if the policy of blockading the China coast was in effect at the time you assumed command of the fleet?

A That was being conducted by my predecessor and by his predecessor; namely, Admirals HASEGAWA and OIKAWA, who preceded me.

And then you took on the same policy and procedure and carried it out during your command; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q As Vice-Chief of Naval General Staff back in 1937, you have testified that you issued orders to Admiral HASEGAWA. I will ask you if those orders were of your own creation?

.

16

15

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

34,808

ı

2

3

seen to what extent the vitness is departing from the question asked.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Let the witness finish his answer.

A (Continuing) In other words, the question of oil which was mentioned by Captain Robinson was not the primary or principal question. It was not even one of the factors. The principal deciding factor was the United States attitude. That is how I replied yesterday.

Q All right. We will leave that subject. I want to go for a moment back to your command of the China Seas Fleet, and ask you if the policy of blockading the China coast was in effect at the time you assumed command of the fleet?

A That was being conducted by my predecessor and by his predecessor; namely, Admirals HASEGAWA and OIKAWA, who preceded me.

And then you took on the same policy and procedure and carried it out during your command; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q As Vice-Chief of Naval General Staff back in 1937, you have testified that you issued orders to Admiral HASEGAWA. I will ask you if those orders were of your own creation?

14

15

9

10

11

12

13

16 17

> 18 19

20

21

23

22

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

No, those orders were not created by me. do not remember now how I replied to a question of a similar nature yesterday, but the Vice-Chief of the Naval General Staff has no authority to issue orders to HASEGAWA. And where did the orders come from, Admiral?

That is the Chief of the Naval General Staff. Λ

And after the orders were issued, did you, as Vice-Chief of Naval General Staff, act as the transmission agency to commanders of the fleet?

These orders were transmitted by telegram, I believe.

And was that your function at times, to handle the transmission of these orders?

There were others in charge of the handling of telegrams.

Now, yesterday the Tribunal asked you regarding the attacks on Kota Bahru, Hong Kong and Shanghai. I will ask you if you knew that those attacks were to take place without notice being first given?

Such was not the case at all. I believe all arrangements were made so that any attack was to begin after the proper and lawful international procedures were taken.

THE MONITOR: Instead of "any attack," just

21

22

23

"war."

What control did you have over those naval units which took part in those attacks?

A I had no control over operations.

Q Well, now, Admiral, the Tribunal, in speaking to you of illegal submarine warfare, I believe, asked you in effect, what would you do in the event that the Chief of Naval General Staff disobeyed your warnings concerning such actions? You told the Tribunal that you would have seen to it that the Chief of Naval General Staff be transferred or changed if he refused to follow your warning.

Now, I will ask you, who appoints the Chief of Naval General Staff?

A His Imperial Majesty, the Emperor.

W 0 1 1 f 2 & 3 L 4 e f 5 1 6

Q Well, if the Emperor appoints the Chief of Naval General Staff, how could you, as Navy Minister, discharge him cr effect a change?

I will have to present my views to the Throne and first receive the permission of the Throne. In the case of the question that arose yesterday, it was about the Chief of the General Staff engaging in some action in complete disregard of international law. In such an event, such an act would be in complete violation, or it would be in contravention of the wishes of His Majesty the Emperor, and so if I presented my views and opinions to the Throne in connection with such an instance, if it occurred, such an act being in violation of His Majesty's wishes, I would be confident that His Imperial Majesty, in the light of his position on the matter, would grant his approval and permission, and so I did not go so far as to explain the procedure in the matter.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Please confine your answers to the questions, Witness. You really answered the question in your first sentence.

MR. BRANNON: I thought that it was quite responsive, if the President please.

I was trying to establish, Mr. President,

11 12

8

9

10

14

13

16

18

20

21

23 24

4

7

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

that the accused did not personally have that power but acted through the Emperor. I may have been guilty in the framing of my question.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Your question was all right. The only point I am raising is this: that he didn't have to go into that long dissertation to tell us that.

BY MR. BRANNON (Continued):

Q Do you know of any case in the history of Japan where the Navy Minister discharged the Naval Chief of General Staff by going to the Emperor against the wishes of the Chief of Naval General Staff? .

It is my understanding that there has been no such case.

Well, was it your duty to report regularly to the Diet?

A. My duties and also a long prevailing practice or custom.

Regarding the question of Japanese naval confidence in regard to the war, I will ask you if you heard the accused KIDO testify before this Tribunal that Admiral NAGANO, at a liaison conference as late as November 1, 1941, said that the Navy was not confident of over a two year war?

34,813

Yes, I heard that.

Have you personally heard Admiral NAGANO discuss this matter and explain his views?

I heard that frequently from Admiral NAGANO himself. And, according to the KIDO diary, Admiral NAGANO is said to have told that to His Majesty the Emperor even before that in July -- the end of July before I returned to Tokyo.

And, did you also share in these views?

Yes. A

Well, now, when a Minister of State, such as yourself, was called in the presence of the Emperor, what was the custom that was ordinarly followed in regard to discussions that took place?

When a summons was received from His Majesty, the Minister of State called to the Imperial palace merely replied to the inquiry from the Throne.

Did you volunteer information?

No. Λ

Now, Admiral, I feel that there is still some doubt as to the meaning of the words in your affidavit regarding your responsibility for the alleged naval atrocities. Are you satisfied that you have set forth in your affidavit your complete views on your responsibility or connection with

3 4

7

8

9 10

11 12

> 13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

alleged naval atrocities?

A Well, I have tried my best to make my affidavit, as a whole, as compact as possible. However, I have a feeling that, with regard to your present question, my explanations may not have been sufficient.

- Q . Would you care to go ahead?
- A May I explain?
- Q Yes, I think the Tribunal would like to hear it.

A Speaking of the work of the Minister of the Navy in connection with prisoners of war, it was his task -- his responsibility to issue regulations for the handling of prisoners of war in accordance with the provisions of international law. It was customary for the Navy to hold prisoners of war for only a very short period, and, therefore, regulations concerning them were very few, such, for instance, as the regulation for the handling of prisoners of war and regulations concerning supplies to prisoners of war. That was all.

The naval commanders on the spot, who happened to capture prisoners of war, were responsible for carrying -- for the handling of prisoners of war in accordance with the regulations issued by the

3 4

5

7

8 9

10

11

13

14

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

34,815

Minister of the Navy. Necessary rules and regulations may have been issued by the commanders in chief of the naval forces on the spot in accordance with and on the basis of the regulations issued by the Navy Minister.

The commander in chief, furthermore, has the duty of appointing and supervising those who take actual charge over prisoner of war affairs.

THE INTERPRETER: Correction: "The Commander in Chief of the naval forces on the spot also has the responsibility of nominating and supervising those who actually handle prisoners of war."

A (Continuing) As for the Navy Minister, because he was responsible for the over-all -- for the general control or supervision of all naval personnel, I wrote in my affidavit in connection with my responsibility, as I felt it, by citing the relationship of a father and his son. But the Minister of the Navy cannot bear the responsibility in so far as the chain of command is concerned, or, that is to say, the chain of command responsibility.

ACTING PRESIDENT: In that connection, further, I have a question from a Member of the Tribunal.

BY THE ACTING PRESIDENT:

Q Had the Navy Ministry anything to do with the transport of prisoners of war from the theatres of war to Japan and Manchuria?

A By transferring of prisoners of war to Manchuria I think means handing over prisoners of war to the Army. With regard to the sending of prisoners of war to Manchuria, the Navy Minister has consultations with the Army in Tokyo, and he further gives directions to the Commander in Chief on the spot with regard to the

destination and number of prisoners of war. actual transportation of prisoners of war from the field, that is, in the theatre of war to Manchuria, would be under the supervision -- would be the job of the commander of the unit handling the transportation. 6 Would it be the same when they were transported to Japan? 7 8 A Yes. 9 Did you receive reports about the numerous 10 deaths during these various voyages? 11 A None whatsoever. 12 ACTING PRESIDENT: That is all. 13 BY MR. BRANNON (Continued): 14 Did you ever hear of the United States 15 submarines during the Pacific War destroying the 16 survivors of ships they had sunk? 17 A Absolutely none. 18 Did you ever hear or know of any member of the Japanese Government in the days preceding the Pacific War or a member of the General staff or any senior statesman or other responsible official of Japan stating his opinion that Japan was not justified in going to war?

should na.-

official. 24

question on re-examination.

19

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BRANNON: Now, the Tribunal will nous. that a new order of proof came out with one document, 25

ACTING PRESIDENT: That is not a proper

destination and number of prisoners of war. The actual transportation of prisoners of war from the field, that is, in the theatre of war to Manchuria, would be under the supervision -- would be the job of the commander of the unit handling the transportation.

Q Would it be the same when they were transported to Japan?

A Yes.

Q Did you receive reports about the numerous deaths during these various voyages?

A None whatsoever.

ACTING PRESIDENT: That is all.

BY MR. BRANNON (Continued):

Q Did you ever hear of the United States submarines during the Pacific War destroying the survivors of ships they had sunk?

A Absolutely none.

Q Did you ever hear or know of any member of the Japanese Government in the days preceding the Pacific War or a member of the General staff or any senior statesman or other responsible official of Japan stating his opinion that Japan was not justified in going to war?

ACTING PRESIDENT: That is not a proper question on re-examination.

13

14

12

6

8

9

10

11

15 16

> 17 18

> > 19

20

22

23

MR. BRANNON: The matters brought up by

Mr. Logan yesterday would infer that there were some

who were opposed to the war as a matter of principle.

The distinction should carefully be made between

whether these senior statesmen thought that Japan

was not justified in a war of, say, self-defense, or

whether they thought it was ill-advised for Japan to

attempt such a war. A material point I charge, Mr.

President. I ask this witness his personal opinion.

ACTING PRESIDENT: You may ask it.

I never heard of any such a thing.

asked by Mr. Logan whether the accused KIDO knew of the Pearl Harbor Operational Plans. I will ask you in fairness to the other accused whether there were any civilian members of the Government who knew of the Navy's Operational Plans prior to December 7, 1941.

A The Pearl Harbor Attack was a highly secret material -- military matter and even in the Navy only a very few knew of it. There is not supposed to be -- there is supposed to be not a single civilian who should have known about this beforehand -- civilian official.

MR. BRANNON: Now, the Tribunal will notice that a new order of proof came out with one document, defense document 2484. This, of course, was the alleged statement of Admiral Nimitz pertaining to American submarine warfare in the Pacific. Since it had been rejected before, I had only one way to attempt to qualify it and that was to ask this witness whether the United States ever practiced submarine warfare such as charged against Japan.

As I understand the prosecution, they state that the only specific charge they make against Japan regarding submarine warfare is that they killed the survives: of ships. I therefore will withdraw defense document 2484 in view of the statement made by the witness which disqualifies it. The question of retaliation was the basis for offering the document again. And by doing this, of course, we do not admit the truthfulness of the prosecution's charge against Japan in this regard.

researched only offered in evidence, and in fairness to the prosecution, who may wish to question the accused concerning these documents, I would like to offer them in evidence at this time.

We offer in evidence defense document 622-B-1, which is an excerpt from the interrogation of Admiral SHIMADA by the prosecution dated 14 March 1946 at Sugamo Prison. It is offered for the purpose of disproving the inference cast by a previous excerpt from the interrogation of Admiral SHIPADA, introduced by the prosecution and appearing on page 10,194 of the record, that he knew about naval operational plans, including the Pearl Harbor attack plan before becoming Navy Minister.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 622-B-1 will receive exhibit No. 3573.

(Thereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 3573 and received in evidence.)

MR. BRANNON: "We offer in evidence defense

34,821

docu-

prisoner-

amended.

fer it

ial, for

re-

scale as

f. This

; was re-

s here

tted in evi-

ment 1804

pove

referred to was marked defense exmubit

3574 and received in evidence.)

MR. BRANNON: I am informed by the prosecution they have no further questions. This concludes the presentation of the defense of Admiral SHIMADA.

> We ask that he may take his place in the dock. ACTING PRESIDENT: He may be returned to the

("hereupon, the witness was excused.)

24

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

dock.

Knapp & Kaplea

I might finish my presentation right now if
the prosecution will permit, because the next two
documents need not be read but only offered in evidence, and in fairness to the prosecution, who may
wish to question the accused concerning these documents, I would like to offer them in evidence at this
time.

We offer in evidence defense document 622-B-1, which is an excerpt from the interrogation of Admiral SHIMADA by the prosecution dated 14 March 1946 at Sugamo Prison. It is offered for the purpose of disproving the inference cast by a previous excerpt from the interrogation of Admiral SHIMADA, introduced by the prosecution and appearing on page 10,194 of the record, that he knew about naval operational plans, including the Pearl Harbor attack plan before becoming Navy Minister.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 622-B-1 will receive exhibit No. 3573.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 3573 and received in evidence.)

MR. BRANNON: We offer in evidence defense

ment 1804-A. It is the regulation concerning prisonerof-war rations issued by the Navy Minister, as amended.
I don't propose to read this document, and offer it
for the convenience and perusal of the Tribunal, for
the purpose of showing that prisoners of war received rations and compensation on the same scale as
officers and men of the Japanese Navy itself. This
document was originally issued in 1904, but was reissued in 1937, 1942, and 1943, and appears here
in its amended form,

ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1804 will receive exhibit No. 3574.

(Thereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 3574 and received in evidence.)

MR. BRANNON: I am informed by the prosecution they have no further questions. This concludes the presentation of the defense of Admiral SHIMADA.

We ask that he may take his place in the dock.

ACTING PRESIDENT: He may be returned to the dock.

("hereupon, the witness was excused.)

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1804-A will receive exhibit 3574-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit 3574-A and received in evidence.)

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Caudle.

PR. CAUDLE: Nr. President, with the permission of the Tribunal I will proceed in the presentation of evidence for the individual defense of the accused SHIRATORI. Before making the opening statement I would like to call attention to two small changes in the document. They appear on page 2 in the third line of the second paragraph.

ACTING PRESIDENT: "e haven't the document. You are talking through the red light.

MR. CAUDLE: I will repeat. I would like to make two small changes on page 2, the third line in the second paragraph; just before the words "Norway, Denmark, and Finland" I would like to insert the word "Sweden": and the last word in that sentence I would like to change from "December" to the word "November.

On page 3, at the end of the first paragraph, I would like to insert the words "record pages 31,255 to 31,257."

I will proceed with the statement:

1

3

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

Now comes SHIRATORI, Toshio, by his counsel:

The defendant SHIRATORI is indicted on the

following counts: Counts 1-17, 27-32, 34 and 44;

that is to say, he is indicted only on the counts on
which the whole accused are indicted.

In their general phases the defense has produced evidence in order to contradict the prosecution's evidence and to show that the latter failed to sustain the aforesaid counts in the Indictment. I wish to state that we rely upon this evidence of the defense for the benefit of SHIRATORI. I will not, however, indicate in particular the evidence upon which I rely. in order to avoid repetition and to save time.

We will contradict or explain all of the evidence offered by the prosecution against the defendant SHIRATORI. But we also clearly deny all the charges by the prosecution against SHIRATORI, which have not been backed by evidence, without regard to whether the denial should be backed by evidence or not, as pertains to acts of commission and of omission.

The prosecution insisted in conclusion:

"Thile he (SHIRATORI) is specially concerned

with Count 5, we submit that he was in the general conspiracy from the beginning, and responsible under all
the counts in which he is charged." (Record page 16,924)

Powever, at the time of the Manchurian Incident we will show that SHIRATORI was the Chief of the 2 Bureau of Information, that is to say, a Section Chief of the Foreign Ministry, who is neither a statesmen nor a politician but an official serving under the control and direction of the Foreign Minister, and we will show that he fulfilled the duties of his office in line with the peace policy of the WAKATSUKI Cabinet.

The prosecution contends, relying on the socalled SHIRATORI letter to ARITA under date of 4 November. 1935 (Fx. No. 774-A), that SHIRATORI advocated war against Pussia, if inevitable, in order to shut her out from advancing into East Asia. But it will be shown that this letter, which is of quite a private nature, is only a copy made from another copy of the original, that it is not sure whether it quite conforms 17 to the original, and further, that it was not an official document of the government as the prosecution 19 alleged.

We will show further that in June, 1933, 21 SHIRATORI was appointed to serve concurrently as 22 Minister for the countries of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and 23 Finland, where he remained until November, 1936, and 24 that the Anti-Comintern Pact was negotiated during his 25 stay in Sweden, far removed from the scene thereof, and

3

10

11

12

finally concluded while he was aboard ship, enroute home from his posts in the Scandinavian countries. Further, that SHIRATORI could have had no part in the China Affair because at the time of the outbreak of this incident he was on the waiting list in the Foreign Office and had no duties, connections, authority or influence of any kind on the policies of his government,

The prosecution made many damaging contentions against SHIRATORI, relying on the telegrams exchanged between Ambassador OTT and the German Government, but we will show that they are all unfounded.

It will be shown that SHTRATORI had nothing to do with the initiation, the talk and the negotiations for concluding a tripartite alliance until early 1939, and then only in a limited capacity, and also had nothing to do with Italy's acceptance to participate in the alliance. Moreover, practically the entire negotiations with Italy were made through Germany.

The prosecution insisted that SMTRATORI advocated an all-out military alliance without reservations; but it will be shown that the Tripartite Alliance, under consideration at the time, was a weak and harmless pact of mutual assistance which would enable a peaceful settlement of the China Incident and would prevent the outbreak of a European war, and which would

20.

not bind Japan automatically to participate in any war for Germany and Italy, or to render military assistance to them in case a European war should break out contrary to expectations. It will be shown that SHIRATORI, seeing that Germany and Italy would not agree to the instructions of the Japanese Government, submitted to his government his opinions advocating conclusion of a weak and harmless alliance for the cause of peace in Europe and in East Asia, without insisting upon the formula of reservation proposed by Japan. It will also be shown that the Japanese Governdid not accept SHIRATORI's opinions, and furment thermore, that the responsibility for treaties or alliances did not finally rest with SHIRATORI, an Ambassador, but with his government (record pages 31,255-31,257)

Moreover, it will be shown that the negotiations for concluding a Tripartite Pact in 1938-1939 finally terminated because of the conclusion of the Non-Aggression Pact between Germany and USSR on 23 August 1939, that the Tripartite Alliance of 27 September 1940 was quite a different one from the pact negotiated in 1938-1939, and that there was no relation between the two.

It will be further shown that SHIRATORI, being PATSUOKA's diplomatic adviser in name only, had nothing

2

6

7 8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

to do with the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact of 27 September 1940, and with the other diplomatic activities of Foreign Minister MATSUOKA.

The prosecution branded SHIRATORI as a propagandist in the so-called "conspiracy" (record page 16.765), probably relying on his activities, contributing articles and delivering lectures. But we will show that he contributed articles and delivered lectures on his own volition and not upon instructions or directions of his government; that he was not, properly speaking, a writer or lecturer, and a certain amount of popularity of his writings and lectures resulted mainly from his outspokenness and indiscretion as a diplomat, end that his writings and lectures were always of a private nature and had only a limited influence. It will also be shown that the main purpose of SMIRATORI's delivering lectures after his return from Rome was to answer certain criticisms against his activities in Italy.

We will show, further, that SMIRATORI was seriously ill for almost one year, beginning in the spring
of 1941, that is to say, during the most decisive period
of the times, and was disabled from engaging in any
position of responsibility; and certainly had no part
in the planning, preparation for, or otherwise in the

3

1

6

7 8

10

9

11

13 14

15 16

17

19

18

20

22

instigation and carrying on of the Pacific "ar; that the serious illness brought about a marked change in his character, drawing him more deeply into a domain of spirituality, and that during the entire period of "orld "ar II he concerned himself very little with worldly affairs.

We will also show that SHIRATORI played no important part as a member of the directorate of the Imperial Rule Assistance Association as well as of the Imperial Rule Assistance Political Society.

In short, we will show that there is no substantial evidence to connect the defendant SHIRATORI with commissions or voluntary omissions so as to be guilty of any of the offences set forth in the Indietment.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045 hours, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

& Y

3

5

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: 'The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. MR. CAUDLE: Mr. President.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Caudle.

MR. CAUDLE: Before proceeding with the evidence I would like to call the attention of the Tribunal to certain deletions in the order of proof. They are noted in the order of proof and they were brought about due to the fact that Mr. Cunningham in the presentation of his defense for Mr. OSHIMA introduced various documents of the Foreign Ministry that we had proposed to use and are now, therefore, already in evidence.

Other deletions were made due to the fact that the record was quoted in a number of instances as to various evidence both pro and con, and it was felt that the references would be better submitted in the final summation.

I will now proceed with the evidence.

I offer in evidence defense document No. 62, the curriculum vitae of SHIRATORI. The prosecution's exhibit No. 125 is also a personal history of SHIRATORI, but does not show the dates on which SHIRATORI left from old posts and arrived at new posts.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in

24

evidence.

3

5

6

10

20

21

23

25

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 62 will receive exhibit No. 3575.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3575 and received in evidence.)

MR. CAUDLE: I will not read defense document No. 62, exhibit No. 3575, but will only refer to and rely on it in necessary cases.

I next offer in evidence defense document No. 75, the Imperial Ordinance concerning organization of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This ordinance 13 was effective from 1929 until 1933 and is slightly different from IPS exhibit No. 26. I will read only 14 the Article 9, which the IPS exhibit does not contain. 15 The purpose is to show that SHIRATORI, as Chief of the Information Bureau of the Foreign Ministry, managed 18 affairs of the same Bureau subject to orders of the 19 Foreign Minister.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 75 will receive exhibit No. 3576.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3576 and received in evidence.)

MR. CAUDLE: I now read Article 9 of said exhibit:

"In order to conduct affairs on information, there will be an Information Board in the Ministry.

"A chief shall be appointed over the same board.

"The chief shall be an official of 'Chokunin' rank. (TN. A rank of Imperial appointment).

"The chief shall manage affairs of the same board, in compliance with orders of the Minister of Foreign Affairs."

Items 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 have been deleted. I would like to call the witness YATSUGI.

KAZUO YATSUGI, recalled as a witness on behalf of the defense, being first duly sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

MR. CAUDLE: The prosecution stated, and I quote: "On the 4th of November 1935, SHIRATORI advised ARITA by letter that the threat of future calamity should be removed while Russia was comparatively impotent. He advocated war if that appeared inevitable in order to shut Russia out completely from advancing

7 8

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

12 13

14

16

15

17 18

19

20

22

23 24

into East Asia." That is record page 16,925; refer also to IPS document No. 2419-A, exhibit No. 774-A, record page 7884.

In the attached "Statement of Official
Procurement" to IPS document No. 2419, it is stated
that the said document was obtained from the Japanese
Government. Now, in order to show (1) that this
"Statement of Official Procurement" is not correct;
(2) that the document is not the original but is a
copy made from another copy of the original; (3) that
it is not sure whether the document quite conformed
to the original, and (4) that the document is not an
official one but is only private letters, I will now
question the witness YATSUGI.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CAUDLE:

Q Please state your name and address.

A My name is YATSUGI, Kazuo; my address: 5 Sakuragaoka-cho, Shibuya-ku, Tokyo.

MR. CAUDLE: May the witness be shown defense document No. 647?

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Q Will you please examine that document and tell us whether or not it is your sworn affidavit?

4 5

3

7

6

10

11 12

13

14

16

17

18

20

21 22

23 24

25

,

2

3

5

6

10

12

14

15

16

18

A This is my sworn affidavit.

Q Are the contents true and correct?

A They are correct.

MR. CAUDLE: I offer in evidence defense document No. 647.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Sandusky.

MR. SANDUSKY: May it please the Tribunal, objection is taken to the whole of paragraph 4 on page 3 of the affidavit. This is for the reason that the letters must speak for themselves. No witness is competent or necessary to explain to the Tribunal the character of the letters which, as the witness himself suggests, can be discerned at a glance. Furthermore, in our submission the epistolary form of the letters is wholly immaterial.

MR. CAUDLE: May it please the Tribunal, the prosecution has contended all through this thing that this letter was an official communication between the defendant SHIRATORI and a Mr. ARITA, and we want to show that it was purely personal. We wish to show that it was purely a personal letter altogether and had no official bearing or relation whatsoever.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained.

With that exception, with the exception of

3

2.

19 20

21

23

paragraph 4, the document may be admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 647

will receive exhibit No. 3577.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3577.)

MR. CAUDLE: I will now read the document:

"(1) I have held the post of Secretary

General of the Society for the Study of National

Policy, for years. As I have testified at the

Tribunal some time ago as a witness for the International Prosecution Section, this Society for the

Study of National Policy is a purely private organization and it is neither an organ of the government

nor a part of it. And Mr. SHIRATORI, Toshio, was not
a member of the same Society and had positively no
relation with this Society.

World War and to collect materials for it, I made a round of calls on veterans and related persons of diplomacy in April 1946 (21st year of Showa), and borrowed various materials. Among the materials borrowed from ARITA, Hachiro were included copies of private letters written by Mr. SHIRATORI, Toshio, who was then the Minister to Sweden, in November 1935

2 3

5

7

9

12

11

14 15

13

16

18

17

20

21

22

19

23

25

(10th year of Showa), and sent to Mr. ARITA, Fachiro, then Ambassador to Belgium. They were two letters of Mr. SHIRATORI, dated November 4 and November 12, and were copies and not originals. From these copies I made other copies for my own use, and returned the copies borrowed from Mr. ARITA. Furthermore, I have never seen the originals of these letters.

members of the International Prosecution Section, and at the time, the above copies of the private letters written by Mr. SHIRATORI, namely, the 'copies of the copies' were confiscated by the IPS along with other documents. I read exhibit 774-A of IPS (IPS document 2419A) and there was no doubt that they were those 'copies of the copies' of the private letters of Mr. SHIRATORI which were confiscated from me."

May the witness be shown IPS exhibit 774-A?

(Whereupon a document was handed to
the witness.)

- Q Will you please examine that document and tell us whether or not it is the document referred to in item 3 of your affidavit?
 - A It is that document.
- Q You stated in your affidavit that you have never seen the originals of these letters. Are you

sure that the document quite conforms to the originals?

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Sandusky.

MR. SANDUSKY: May it please the Tribunal,
I object to that question on the ground of incompetency.
Since the witness admits that he has never seen the
original document he obviously cannot tell the Tribunal
whether the copy does or does not conform to the
original.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Objection sustained.

Q In the attached "Statement of Official Procurement" it is stated that the document was obtained from the Japanese Government. But, if the document was seized by the prosecution from you, as you stated in your affidavit, the aforesaid insistence of the "Statement of Official Procurement" is not correct, is it?

MR. SANDUSKY: Mr. President, objection is taken to this question because the question is actually argument under the guise of a question. We submit that conclusions on evidence are to be drawn by the Tribunal.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Caudle.

MR. CAUDLE: Mr. President, I submit, sir, that that witness knows more about the history of this document than anyone in this courtroom. He knows where

2

5

4

7 8

9

10 11

12

13

15

16

18 19

20

21

23

it came from, how it was taken by the IPS, and how it finally reached these Chambers. Having such knowledge and information he certainly should know whether that certificate of procurement is correct or incorrect.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained.

Q Have you ever been an official of the Japanese Government?

A Not once up to now.

MR. CAUDLE: You may cross-examine.

MR. SANDUSKY: May it please the Tribunal, there will be no cross-examination.

MR. CAUDLE: May the witness be excused on the usual terms?

ACTING PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

If it please the Tribunal, in line with this same matter, I would like to refer to certain objections made by defense counsel NARITOMI to the same document when it was introduced by the prosecution which occurred on the 16th day of October, 1946 and appears in the record at pages 7879 to 7882.

Item 10 in the order of proof has been deleted.

I will next read the parts of exhibit No.

774A which were not read by the prosecution to show
the personal nature of the document, that the same
was not an official communication and, further, to
clarify the true contents thereof. It starts from
the beginning of page 1 of exhibit 774A, and I read:
"November 4 --

"Dear ARITA:

"I hear that it is at last decided that you are to go to China."

I now read the second paragraph of page 1, exhibit 774A:

"What I have put down here is a conclusion drawn from my long-cherished and later revised views based on both what I acquired by reading extensively during my two years' stay in Sweden and what I had heard from authorities on Russia. However, as it was

. 7

dashed off at a sitting, there may be inconsistent points in my aim. At any rate, my bad style does not fully express my intentions." Three, the ending of page 1 of exhibit 774A 4 is "Yours respectfully, SHIRATORI." 5 ACTING PRESIDENT: Are you reading exhibit 7743 7 MR. CAUDLE: 774A. If it please your Honor, 8 I think some language corrections have been made in 9 this exhibit, and it might be just a little difficult 10 for you to follow. May I inquire if the Court has 11 copies of these excerpts? 12 ACTING PRESIDENT: I have exhibit 774 which 13 the Clerk just handed me. That does not have the 14 15 corrections in it. MR. CAUDLE: I don't understand it, sir. It 16 was placed in the order of proof, and it was supposed 17 18 to have been --19 ACTING PRESIDENT: Proceed with your reading. 20 MR. CAUDLE: Four, from the beginning of 21 page 2 of said exhibit: "12 November, Shows 10/1935 23 "Dear Mr. ARITA: 24 "Your prompt reply and comments on my humble 25

opinion"

Then we go to paragraph 5 of page 2:

for you without taking any copies, has not been prepared to be shown to others."

The ending on page 2 is "Sincerely yours, SHIRATORI."

Seven: Paragraph 1, second line of page 4 of said exhibit:

"The Foreign Office should be aware that
the situation prior to the manchurian Incident more
than proved that mere formality such as 'Sino-Japanese
Good-Will' has no value, on the other hand, the militarists appear to be focusing their eyes on North
China, trying to build up a somewhat modified and
moderated manchukuo. Foreign views aside, from the
standpoint of the interests of the Empire itself, the
propriety of such policy is at least very problematic."

Same paragraph, 17th line of page 4 of said exhibit:

"Therefore, our future policy towards China should be aimed solely at the exclusion of outside influences and disregarding entirely immediate small profits."

Second paragraph of page 4 to page 5, first line of said exhibit:

7.

"Although we may mention 'exclusion of foreign influences, we, of course, do not mean the exclusion of all foreign activities in order to acquire monopolistic positions. For instance, I believe that due respects should be given to the various British, American and other legitimate establishments in China, and moreover, we should be so prepared as to give them willing cooperation. By excluding foreign influences from China, we do not mean to be the socalled 'dog in the manger,' but only the expulsion of all influences which are harmful to China, and consequently to Japan. Although we may say that this shall be applicable to all, regardless of what that country may be, when we take a general view, we find that the activities of the various countries in China today do not retain any vestige of the former days when each country had her own sphere of influences. Only a few relics of the former age remain, but in general, they could be said to be unharmful. If Japan takes the initiative, for instance, in discarding the rights of extra-territoriality and other formal special rights, and of having the foreign settlement removed, and the number of foreign advisors reduced, would not the rest be satisfactory?

"It is needless to say that, among the

3

2

7

6

5

8 9

10 11

> 12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

foreign influences that should above all be expelled, is that of Red Russia. This is a question on which our Empire's diplomacy must concentrate its main force in the future, and Sino-Japanese concert and cooperation with the Anglo-Americans are necessary for the solution of this problem."

Ten: From the 22nd line of the 2nd paragraph of page 6 of said exhibit:

that adoption of a policy for an instantaneous removal of future calamity at this stage when they are comparatively impotent is a matter which should never be neglected by those who bear concern for the welfare of the people and nation. I am not saying that we should unreasonably force a war against Soviet Russia now. I am only saying that we should start negotiations with her with determination, not refusing even war if it is inevitable, to shut her out completely from advancing into East Asia."

Eleven: Second paragraph of page 7 of said exhibit:

"On the basis that it is determined not to refuse war if inevitable, diplomatic measures relative to this should be taken as early as possible. Since the relationship of Germany and Poland with Russia

4 5

7 8

Whalen & Mors

is the same as ours, there is no need for us to make any specific understanding with them. Once the war breaks out they will surely rise. The only problem is England."

(12) (Same paragraph, line 11 of page 7 of the said exhibit.)

England? This will be the most urgent question. The first step is to open a way for an understanding on problems in regard to China. For this purpose, we, of course, must slacken the pace of our China policy but, as Britain should be able fully to recognize Japan's position in East Asia, we should not have to make many concessions. The fact is that this has been what Britain desired while we have been rather reluctant. Therefore, as far as it concerns China, I believe the problem is soluble."

(13) (2d paragraph of page of said exhibit.)

"6. The aim of our policy toward China is self-evident from the explanation stated above. The nucleus is a Sino-Japanese Alliance against the Soviet.

Japan should cooperate with China in having the absolute sovereignty of Hsinchiang and Outer Mongolia restored, cooperate in subjugating Communist rebels, cooperate in reorganizing and strengthening the Chinese armed

forces. Japan-Great Britain cooperation in China should be within these bounds. Other problems are minor details and trivialities of everyday occurrence. Furthermore, since the said policy does not infringe on any existing treaties, not only will it be free from criticism viewed from international morals but a Sino-Japanese Alliance formed to confront Communism which is the enemy of a great number of peoples in the world today, would certainly draw sympathy from world opinion and even the United States would understand the real intention of Japan towards China, and there will also be a great change of general opinion as regards the Manchurian Incident. In brief, success would depend on the method of execution and preparation."

I next refer to exhibit 3575 to show that SHIRATORI was Minister to Sweden in November 1935, the time this letter was written.

I next offer in evidence defense document No. 156 in order to show the fact that ARITA, Hachiro, to whom the letter was addressed, was Ambassador to Belgium in November 1935, and that he was transferred from Belgium to China.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be admitted in evidence.

CLELK OF THE COURT: Defense document 156

24

10

11

12

15

17

18

20

22

23

will receive exhibit No. 3578.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3578 and received in evidence.)

MR. CAUDLE: I will read exhibit 3578, which is a very short document.

"Certificate.

"Former Foreign Minister AkITA, Hachiro, born 21 September, 1834.

pointed Ambassador to Belgium 2 November 8th year of Showa (1933); arrived at his post at Brussels 19 February 9th year of Showa (1934); ordered home 16 November 10th year of Showa (1935) and left Brussels 4 December of the same year (1935); arrived at Tokyo 10 January 11th year of Showa (1936); appointed Ambassador to China 8 February of the same year; left Tokyo 22 February of the same year (1936) and arrived at his post at Shanghai 26 February of the same year."

Signed "TERAOKA, Kohei

"Chief of Personnel Section, Foreign Minister's Secretariat.

"14 October 1946."

ACTING PRESIDENT: Do you omit Item 12, defense document 62?

11

13

14

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

16

17

19

20

21

23

24

290000

MR. CAUDLE: I didn't quite understand what you meant, if you please?

Yes, sir, that is what I was referring to.
ACTING PRESIDENT: All right. Go shead.
MR. CAUDLE: Item 14 has been deleted.

The prosecution offered in evidence against
SHIR. TORI many telegrams exchanged between ambassador
Ott and the German Government which formed the greatest
and most important part of the evidence of the prosecution against SHIR. TORI. In order to contradict this
evidence, I offer in evidence defense document No. 1929,
the interrogation of Ott by me.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Sandusky.

MR. SANDUSKY: May it please the Tribunal, the prosecution is obliged to make numerous objections to this voluminous interrogatory of 117 questions and answers. Because my remarks are necessarily extended, I have had them reproduced for the Tribunal in order to assist the Tribunal in following the course of my objections more easily. I will be as brief as possible in citing grounds for objection, but I am prepared to argue any specific objection more fully if the Tribunal should so desire.

Mr. President, would you care to have a copy of the objection?

.

ACTING PRESIDENT: I think it would be of assistance to us.

Min. SANDUSKY: At page 8, question 2---

bit. CAUDLE: If it please the Tribunal, I see no reason now to object to these questions at this time. I would suggest that he object at such time as the question is read in that the interrogation more or less forms a sort of pattern, and you might be able to more judiciously determine the objection if you had the advantage of the background and the information afforded by prior questions before the particular question is asked.

MOTING PRESIDENT: Do you intend to read this whole interrogation?

MR. C.UDLE: Yes, sir.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Sandusky.

MR. S. NDUSKY: If in the opinion of the Court it would be more expeditious and they could give more considered judgment to the objections by following the course outlined by Mr. Caudle, I am willing to interrupt as he proceeds with the reading.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The Tribunal will hear your objections as they come up, according to Mr. Caudle's suggestion.

Subject to any objections that will hereafter

be made and sustained, the document is admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COUNT: Defense document 1929 will receive exhibit No. 3579.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3579 and received in evidence.)

I would like to make a short statement as to how and why and under what circumstances this interrogation came to be had.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Is that material?

MR. CAUDLE: It relates to the proceedings and agreement we had in hearings before Justice Webb.

I didn't know and I was not certain whether the Tribunal was familiar with the circumstances.

MR. SANDUSKY: Mr. President, in the interest of saving time, we object to the procedure proposed on the ground of immateriality.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Proceed with the reading of the interrogatory. MR. CAUDLE: All right, sir. (Reading) "International Military Tribunal for the Far 3 4 Fast. "The United States of America, et al. 5 6 against -7 "ARAKI, Sadao, et al. "REPORTER: Miss F. M. Knight. 8 9 WITNESS: General Eugen Ott. "EXAMINING ATTORNEY: Charles B. Caudle, Counsel for 10 11 SHIRLTORI, Toshio. "MR. CAUDLE: General, inasmuch as I understand 12 13 you speak excellent English, I will carry on this inter-14 rogetion in that language, in that neither the reporter 15 nor I speaks German, if that is agreeable with you. 16 "GENERAL OTT: It will be quite all right. 17 "Q General, will you please state your name, 18 place of legal residence and place of present residence. 19 "A Eugen Ott. Legal residence, Icking, near 20 Munich, Germany. Present residence, Peiping, China. 21 "Q Will you please state your present political 22 status, and whether or not you are at present, or have 23 at any time, been held in custody, or charged with any 24 offense crising out of your political activities prior

to and during the war commonly known as 'World War 2'.

"A I am a German national, former German Ambassedor to Japan. I am not now, nor have I ever been held in custody or charged with any offense arising from my political activites before and during the last wer. However, when summoned to Tokyo by the prosecution for interrogetion, I was by mistake held in custody in Peiping for one night by the Chinese Police. This misunderstanding was straightened out the following day.

"Q Will you please state your official position with the German Government prior to your first visit to Japan.

"A I was an Army officer attached to the Reichswehr Ministry as Chief of the Political Lepartment.

"Q Please state when you first arrived in Janan end in what official capacity.

"L I arrived in Japan in June 1933 as official observer for the German Army attached to the Jananese Army.

"Q How long did you remain at this time?

"A I remained until December 1933 and then returned to Germany.

"Q When did you next go to Japan and in what official capacity?

"A I went to Japan next in March 1934 as Military

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 2

3

5

8

7

10

13

12

15 16

17

14

18

20

21

22

24 25

Attache to the German Embassy in Tokyo.

How long did you remain as Military Attache, and what was your next official position

"A I remained as Military Attache until Jarch 1938 and was next appointed German Ambassador to Japan in April 1938 after the recall of Ambassador von Dirksen.

"Q How long did you serve as Cerman Ambassador to Japan and what official position did you occupy after being relieved of this assignment?

"A I served as German Ambassador until January

1943, and was then placed on the waiting list of
Ambassadors. When my successor, Ambassador Stahmer, had
taken over my post, I moved my residence to Peiping,
China, where I have lived continuously since.

"Q Why did you not return to Germany at that time or thereafter?

thereafter because I had not got the permission to do so, although I made a number of requests to Hitler through the Reich's Foreign Minister to return by blockade running ship and to re-enter the German Army.

"Q General, as I have advised you, I am American Lefense Counsel for SHIRATORI, Toshio, one of the Japanese accused of alleged war crimes, now standing trial before the International Military Tribunal for the Far East at Tokyo. Will you please state when, where and under what circumstances you first met the said accused.

"A I met SHIRATORI, as far as I remember, for the first time about October or November 1938, prior to his departure for Rome as Japanese Ambassador to Italy, on the occasion of a farewell dinner given by the Italian Ambassador in Tokyo.

"O Prior to his denarture to assume this most, did you at any time discuss with him in any capacity, either personal or official, the then pending or proposed alliance between Japan, Germany and Italy.

"A I never discussed with SHIRATORI, prior to his departure, any alliance between Japan, Germany and Italy. In fact, at that time, I know of no negotiations having been started.

"Q "hen and under what conditions did you first learn of such negotiations?

"A I learnt of such negotiations first in April
1939 by the German Military Attache, Colonel Matzky,
to whom the Japanese Army had given a confidential hint.

"Q When and how were you first officially notified of this by your Government?

in the latter part of April 1939 in response to my wired

request for information about this subject.

"Q Will you please state what instructions were given to you at that time as to the activities you should take, and the course you should follow as to the said negotiations?

"A Ribbentrop instructed me at that time to keep strictly secret the personal information which he had wired to me, and to act as if I had never heard of it, if addressed by anyone, even by the Italian Ambassador in Tokyo. He, however, requested me to observe developments and to report accordingly.

"Q Please state when and under what circumstances you took the first active part in these negotiations and what activity you did take.

"A I took the first active part in those negotiations with the Japanese Government in May 1939 when the Japanese Foreign Minister handed over to me a letter from the Prime Minister, HIRANUMA, to Hitler to be conveyed, through the Reich's Foreign Minister. Upon request I forwarded this message.

JO Did SHIRATORI communicate in any mennar whatsoever with you during his stay in Europe?

"A No, I did not hear from SHIRATORI at any time during his stay in Europe.

"Q When and under what conditions did you meet

3

1

5

6

7 8

9

10

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19 20

21

23

SHIRATORI the second time?

"A I think I met him the second time after his return to Tokyo some time during the latter fall of 1939, at an official function riven by the Italian imbassador.

"Q How often did you meet him within the next several months after that?

"A I met him rerely.

"? Fid you discuss any political matters, and particularly the German-Japanese-Italian Alliance during these times?

"A Our meetings were social and I think that these matters were not discussed during that time.

"Q Plase state if you know what official position SHIRATORI occupied on his return to Tokyo from Rome.

"A SHIRATORI was still nominally Japanese Ambessador to Italy, but in fact was relieved of every function of his post.

"Q Died SHIRATORI take any part in the German-Japanese-Italian negotiations during the time from his return to Tokyo until he was officially relieved of his Ambassadorship in early 1941?

".. No. All negotistions had been stopped after the conclusion of the German-Russian Non-Aggression Prot in August 1939.

9

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

2-1

1 2

2

4

5

3

9

7

10

12 13

14

16

17 18

> 19 20

22

23

21

24 25

"Q Please explain the condition of German-Japanese relations immediately after the signing of the German-Russian Pact and during the months that ensued.

"A The conclusion of the German-Russian Non-Aggression Pact struck Japan as a surprising blow, and caused the resignation of the HIRANUMA Cabinet. All negotiations with Germany about the Alliance were stopped, and relations between Germany and Japan cooled down to a low degree. This situation existed until about the late spring of 1940, when the development of the War in Europe began to reflect in a changed Japanese mind. I might also say that the strong economic measures taken by the Government of the United States against Japan contributed likewise to this change of the Japanese mind.

"Q Please state if you know the official position or status of SHIRATORI upon being relieved of his Ambassadorial post, and further, if you know how long or to what date he remained in such a status.

"A I learnt that he was placed on the waiting list of ambassadors about three months after his return to Tokyo, at a reduced salary. He kept this status until late August 1940 when he was appointed Adviser to the Foreign Minister. I might add that it is the normal procedure to retain Chiefs of Mission for three months

efter recall in their former official status in order to assist financial readjustment, as it was the same upon my retirement. 3 "O Lid you have any official relations with him during this time? 5 "A I had no official relations with SHIR/TORI during this time. I saw him occasionally in a private 7 espacity." 0 I think the next question is to be objected o. I will first ask the question, sir. 10 "Q "es the Allience for which the verious Govern-11 12 ments worked during the period up to this date ever 13 doncluded?" ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Sandusky. 14 MR. SANDISKY: May it please the Tribunel, 160 bjection is made to the next three questions. As for 17question 2 on page 8, the first sentence of the answer ists objectionable as being a voluntary conclusion not iresponsive to the question. The defensive or aggressive 20 haracter of the various drafts of the abortive pact is 2k conclusion for the Tribunal to draw from the evidence 23ubmitted. Question 3 --MR. CAUDLE: Let us argue this one first. CTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Caudle. MR. CAUTLE: I contend that this man was a party

23

24

to the negotiations. He, at that time, was an ambassador and represented the German Government in Japan. Certainly if any one should know what the true intent and purposes of the negotiations were it should be him. Also,

Mr. Sandusky is objecting to the answer because there certainly can be no room for an objection to the question, and I couldn't testify for him. I had to take the answer I got.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled.

MR. CAUDLE: It isn't necessary to repeat the question.

"A The principal aim of the Alliance negotiated for up to that time was a defensive mact against Russia. Such an alliance was never concluded.

"Q When was the Alliance known as the Tripartite Pact concluded, and what were its aims?"

MR. SANDUSKY: May it please the Tribunal, objection is made to the second part of that question and, of course, to all of the answer after the first sentence. The aims of the pact are to be determined from the pact itself and we submit that such determination is a function of the Court.

MR. CAUDLF: I submit, sir, that the pact was not concluded and that the only way you can find out

-6

18 19

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

23

24

what the true intentions and the desires of those who were negotiating it would certainly be from one who took part in the negotiations.

I beg to correct something. That was the Tripartite Pact that was concluded instead of not concluded.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained.

> We will now adjourn until 1:30. (Whereupon, st 1200, a recess was

taken.)

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

ACTING PRESIDENT: With the Tribunal's permission, the accused TOGO will be absent from the courtroom the whole of the afternoon session conferring with counsel.

Mr. Caudle.

MR. CAUDLE: Mr. President, I will resume reading the interrogation of General Eugene Ott.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Is there another objection here?

MR. CAUDLE: Yes, sir. It is the second question from the bottom on page 8. (Reading):

"Q Was it ever the intention and purpose of this pact which created this Three-Power Alliance that the parties thereto, in cooperation with each other, would conquer the entire world?"

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Sandusky.

MR. SANDUSKY: Mr. President, we submit this is clearly an attempt to forswear one of the issues before this Tribunal.

17 18

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19 20

21

22 23

ACTING PRESIDENT: As one of my colleagues remarks, the answer does not give any information either. He just simply says he does not know.

MR. CAUDLE: I think, if it please your Honor, it says such an intention was never mentioned to him, and you must remember that he was one of the negotiators for the pact.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Objection sustained.

MR. CAUDLE (Reading):

"Q Inasmuch as SHIRATORI became an official advisor to the Japanese Foreign Office in late August 1940 and the Three-Power Allience was concluded in late September 1940, is it not true that he occupied his new position for a period of only one month prior to the conclusion of the treaty?

"A Yes.

papers introduced as evidence before the Tribunal by the prosecution, those being communications between you and your government in Berlin. I will show you each of these copies and with your permission I would like to ask you some questions relating to them.

Although these documents were introduced into evidence at various stages of the trial now under progress, and bear exhibit numbers at variance with the dates of

.

same, I will, for the sake of clarity and expediency, present them to you in their chronological order for your answers and comments."

May I make a side statement, please. I will call the page of the record that each exhibit appears on as I read them for the convenience of the Tribunal in locating them, if they so desire.

"I now hand you copy of exhibit No. 502

(page of the record, 6097 to 6102), a communication
to you dated 26 Aprtl 1939 from the German Foreign
Minister, von Ribbentrop. Will you please read this
document and explain the contents thereof. (Copy of
paper was handed to witness.)

"A This is a document I referred to previously. It informed me for the first time about the negotiations for conclusion of a defensive alliance going on between Germany, Italy and Japan. It is evident therefore that these negotiations had been started already in the summer of 1938 without my knowledge.

"Q This, then, is the message you received from Ribbentrop in answer to your inquiry concerning the negotiations. Upon receipt of this communication what action did you take, if any?

"A I took no action. As I have already explained, I had been instructed not to enter

into any activities except observation and reporting of developments, as you will find in the last part of this document.

"Q Did any of your observations disclose any activity on the part of the Japanese Government in Tokyo which may have resulted from any acts or communications from SHIRATORI in this regard?

"A I do not remember hearing SHIRATORI mentioned by the Japanese side.

"Q I now hand you copy of exhibit No. 503
(record pages 6103 to 6107), dated 4 May 1939, the
same being a communication from you to the German
Foreign Office. Will you please explain what this
document is and for what purpose it was dispatched.
(Copy handed to witness.)

"A This is the message of Prime Minister
HIRANUMA, referred upon before, when I first took
part in the negotiations with the Japanese Government.
It was dispatched on May 4, 1939, in an effort to
break the deadlock in the negotiations, at the request of the Japanese Foreign Minister.

"Q I now hand you copy of exhibit No. 504 (record pages 6108 to 6111), dated 5 May 1939, and direct your attention to the paragraph thereof which I will quote, due to its briefness. It reads as

follows: "'From the Foreign Ministry a senior 1 official who stands especially close to Ambassador SHIRATORI, let me know personally that, in the entire 4 government a deep cleft between friends and enemies of the alliance had formed.' "I presume that this was one of the causes of the deadlock just referred to. (Copy handed to witness.) "A I think so. 10 "Q Who was this person? 11 "A As far as I can remember, this person was 12 either MATSUSHIMA or KURIHARA, both senior members of the Japanese Foreign Ministry. 14 "Q Do you know where he obtained this informa-15 16 tion? "A No, but I presume it came from the discus-17 sion in the Foreign Ministry in Tokyo. 18 "Q At that time was not SHIRATORI in Europe? 19 20 "A Yes, he was. 21 "Q Then, why did you mention the name of SLIRATORI in this message? 23 "A I mentioned the name of SHIRATORI for the reason that it might add to the weight of the report in the mind of the German Foreign Minister.

"Q I now hand you a copy of exhibit No. 2198 (record pages 15,744 to 15,745), dated 11 August 1939, from you to the German Foreign Office, relating to information given you by General HACHIJIRI relative to conditions in the then cabinet as pertains to German-Japanese-Italian relations, and conveying communications from the then Japanese War Minister. You will find that this document states in the second paragraph of section 3 thereof that, for reasons enumerated in the communication, the War Minister would risk his resignation as a last resort in the furtherance of better relations, which would also certainly entail the resignation of Ambassadors OSHIMA and SHIRATORI. (Copy handed to witness.) Also on page 2 of this document you will note that you stated in paragraph 2 thereof that it was imperative that a decision in reply to the concessions demanded be made by August 15, 1939, the same being within four days, and that the War Minister would communicate the measure he had taken direct to OSHIMA and SHIRATORI, by-passing the Foreign Minister. First, I will ask you about the second part of your message before I proceed.

Do you know whether or not it was the usual practice of the War Minister to by-pass the Foreign

25

23

24

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Ministry in communicating with SHIRATORI?

"A This is the only case I was informed of when the War Minister by-passed the Foreign Minister in communication with SHIRATORI about these negotiations.

"A Thy was this unusual procedure followed, if you know?

"A It is obvious that it was a matter of extreme urgency because the answer had been requested within four days. By sending through the usual channels, there was a possibility of delay.

"Q As to the first part of this message referred to, what thereafter happened?

"A I have no knowledge of what happened immediately after that, but on August 29 the Japanese Cabinet resigned, following the non-aggression pact between Germany and Russia. Afterwards all negotiations between the Three Powers ceased, as I have previously pointed out.

"Q I now hand you a copy of exhibit No. 498 (record pages 6082 to 6083 and 6130), dated September 8, 1936, the same being a communication from you to your government, wherein the last four lines read as follows:

"The Ambassador in Moscow!" -- which is a

misprint and should read "Rome" -- "'SHIRATORI, will return from Rome since at that time he had taken up the post of Ambassador purely in the expectation that he would succeed in concluding an Italian-Japanese-German Military Alliance.'

"Do you know of your own knowledge, or had you ever been officially, or even semi-officially, advised that he was appointed for this specific purpose: (Copy handed to witness.)

"A No.

"Q Do you know to your own knowledge, or had you ever been officially, or even semi-officially, advised that he took this post at Rome with any expectation whatsoever of concluding this alliance?

"A No.

"Q Then this information communicated in this document must have been based on hearsay. Is that correct?

"A I think so."

I think the next question is to be objected to. I will read the question.

"Q I now hand you copy of exhibit No. 507, dated 9 September 1939, the same being a communication from you Ribbentrop to you in Tokyo, wherein it is stated on the second page, at the end of the second

And the destruction of the state of the second of the seco

Is a reflected by on y a restaurate to 12 by

2.1

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

paragraph, that -- 'SHIRATORI, who will soon return to Tokyo from his post as Ambassador in Rome, will also work in this idea,' which, from the other parts of the document, I assume the idea being of better Russo-Japanese relations. (Copy handed to witness.) As you have previously stated that you only saw ShIRATORI very rarely, and then only at social functions, at which times no political talks of any nature took place, and further that your first private talk with him took place the latter part of February 1940 upon the visit of Mr. Stahmer to Tokyo, SHIRATORI did not take the active part predicted by Ribbentrop. Is that correct?

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Sandusky.

MR. SANDURKY: May it please the Tribunal, objection is taken to this question; first, because the question is so grossly leading as to amount to testimony by counsel, and second, after a close study of the interrogatory, I cannot agree that counsel has correctly represented the previous statements of the witness which he includes in his question. And last, even if accurate and not leading, the question is pure argument on the evidence.

MR. CAUDLE: If it please the Tribunal, this is purely a hypothetical question. If you remember, he testified that he saw SHIRATORI only at social functions and that no political matters were discussed. This telegram infers that he would take an active part, when, in fact, as has already been related, he did not; and the question is simply to refresh his recollection of what he said before, before asking him the question itself.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is sustained.

MR. CAUDLE: (Reading)

"Q I now hand you exhibit No. 511 (record page 6141-6143) dated 23 February 1940, the same being a communication to your Foreign Office signed

3 4

2 3

5

4

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

18

17

20 21

19

23 24

25

22

'Stahmer-Ott,' wherein the first paragraph, first sentence, reads:

"'After my arrival here I found such Japanese already known to me as OSHIMA, SHIRATORI, TERAUCHI, ISHII, etc., in an unchanged, friendly attitude, and ready for every support.'

"(Copy handed to Witness.)

"General, this message seems to have been sent by Mr. Stahmer, however it is signed, 'Stahmer-Ott.' Will you please explain how this occurred?

The message was sent by Mr. Stahmer, but due to the regulations for sending of cypher telegrams from the German Mission abroad to the Home Government, the Chief of Mission had always to sign such a telegram for expedition.

You at that time were the Chief of the German Mission in Japan. Is that correct?

Yes. "A

Please explain under what circumstances you gentlemen saw SHIRATORI.

As far as I remember, Mr. Stahmer paid a private visit in my company to SHIRATORI, due to the instructions of Ribbentrop to get in touch with the personal acquaintances of Ribbentrop in Japan."

I think the next question will be objected to.

"Q What was meant by the phraseology, 'in an unchanged, friendly attitude,' and 'ready for every support'?"

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Sandusky.

MR. SANDUSKY: Mr. President, again we submit that the document must speak for itself. We respect-fully argue that evidence is unnecessary and improper where the language in question is clear and unambiguous.

MR. CAUDLE: Your Honor, I think he would have a right, if he was a party to the telegram, to explain what he meant by it.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is sustained.

MR. CAUDLE: (Reading)

"Q What was the occasion of Mr. Stahmar's visit to Tokyo?

of Ribbentrop to the mission of the Duke of Saxe-Coburge Gotha, sent to Japan and the United States of America at that time. This mission was sent to Japan in order to present the congratulations of Hitler on the occasion of the 2,600th anniversary of the founding of the Japanese Empire, and was sent to the United States as a goodwill mission to the Red Cross Society.

"Q Did SHIRATORI after this take any more active

part in furthering German-Japanese relations than before?

He did not, as far as I know, until the late spring of 1940, when both the war events in Europe and the American commercial measures enforced upon Japan were changing gradually the Japanese mind, as I stated previously."

This question will be objected to:

Is it not true that during all of this time, 110 and even up to the very last part of August 1939, SHIRATORI still occupied no official status other than that of being on the ambassadorial waiting list, as brought out before, and could not have taken, or carried on, any official activity in this regard?"

MR. SANDUSKY: Mr. President, we submit that in addition to being grossly leading, the question is an attempt to argue the evidence, particularly in the last portion.

MR. CAUDLE: If it please the Tribunal, he testified previously in this interrogation that at this time SHIRATORI was on the waiting list; and he being the German representative in Japan, and being the one most apt to be approached by SHIRATORI or anyone in connection with the discussions of this proposed pact, he certainly should know whether SHIRATORI took any part in it or

not.

24

25

2

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

, 20

21

22

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is sustained.

MR. CAUDLE: (Reading)

I now hand you copy of exhibit No. 516 (record page 6152-6153) dated 12th June 1940, from you to your government, wherein you speak of Japanese-American relations among other matters, and call your special attention to the second, third and fourth paragraphs thereof. Will you please explain in detail just what you mean by the same, covering historical background, Japanese psychology and existing conditions at the time the communication was sent. (Copy handed to Witness.)

The background of this report of June 12, 1940, is as follows:

"The collapse of France was obviously imminent, and the British situation was very precarious, centering round Dunkirk. The only effective relief which might keep up the resistance power of England, and work against the early settlement of the war, could come from the United States of America, and was asked from them very urgently. Therefore the German Government endeavoured to hamper such a relief, and considered as a useful way a continued tension in the Pacific area, which might 24 prevent the United States from removing their attention and fighting forces from the Pacific to the Atlantic.,

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

It was a complicated matter to advance such a policy upon Japan because the Japanese attitude was much divided as it is given in the first part of my report. In this situation I got instructions to back an Italian protest obviously against a Japanese measure in favour of the United States and contrary to the Italian interests — I do not recall the case exactly. When I presented my objections to the Reich Government's intentions I had to avoid the permanent distrust of Ribbentrop that I was inclined to block his aims. Therefore I stressed in paragraphs No. 3 and 4 of my report that I was working in my own way, and pointed to the cooperation of SHIRATORI and other Japanese persons known to Ribbentrop in order to impress him and to succeed in my objections.

"Q Did you mean, in the fourth paragraph of this document, that the Embassy, OSHIMA and SHIRATORI worked together in a common programme, based upon a mutual understanding and common agreement, and if so, what was the aim?

"A No, I did not mean that because there was no such agreement.

"Q What, if anything, did SHIRATORI do in this regard?

" SHIRATORI, as far as I know, warned by private

talks, and sometimes by the press, against the courting of the United States, after they had enforced hard economic measures upon Japan.

"Q Was this a part of a concerted plan taken by him, OSHIMA, and you?

"A No, it was not a common plan. I had only private talks with each of them separately, and OSHIMA kept himself much apart from political activities during his stay in Japan.

"Q Were you ever in the company of SHIRATORI and OSHIMA at the same time for the purpose of carrying out this so-called political cooperation?

"A No, I was not.

"Q Then why do you state that there was close cooperation between you?

"A As I stated before, I used this expression in order to give weight to the message, and to carry through my objections. I might add that I used the names of KONOYE and SUETSUGU for the same reason.

of the record 6175-6177) dated 24 June 1940, the same being a communication from you to your Foreign Office, wherein, in paragraph 3, you state:

"'Also Ambassador SHIRATORI, who is more frequently named as the coming Foreign Minister,

ndvocated a Non-Aggression Pact with Russia in an interview yesterday with Yomuri.' (Copy handed to Witness.)

"What, or who, is Yomuri?

"A 'Yomuri' is the name of a Tokyo newspaper.

"Q What was SHIRATORI's official status at that time?

"A SHIRATORI was still on the waiting list of ambassadors.

"Q I now hand you a copy of exhibit No. 538

(page of the record 6265) dated 2 August 1940, another of your communications to your government, wherein the second paragraph states:

that he had declined the post of Vice-Foreign Minister.

It is to be considered that he will now be appointed

permanent Adviser to the Foreign Minister. He believes
that he can exercise a far-reaching influence in this

capacity.' (Copy handed to Witness.)

"Did he receive such an appointment, and if so, did he at any time to your knowledge exercise a far-reaching influence in that capacity?

"A Yes, he did get the appointment as permanent Adviser to the Foreign Minister, but to my knowledge he did not exercise a far-reaching influence in such a capacity, as later developments, especially during the

7 8

negotiations for a conclusion of the Tripartite Pact, proved.

"Q Do you know the difference in importance between Vice-Foreign Minister and Adviser to the Foreign Minister; that is, the duties, responsibilities and influence of the two respective positions? If so, please describe.

experience. By my official relations with several ViceForeign Ministers of Japan I realized that a ViceForeign Minister was the permanent representative of
the Foreign Minister in all dealings with Foreign
Missions, which the Foreign Minister did not take up
personally. Furthermore, he was responsible for the
administration and personnel matters of the ministry.
I think that his position is comparable to the Under
Secretary of State of the United States. The Adviser
had none of these functions, and his effectiveness
depended upon the personal influence he had with the
Foreign Minister.

..

3

"Q. Do you know whether or not SHIRATORI had any personal influence with MATSUOKA, the then Foreign Minister, and if so, please state?

"A. I did not observe such an influence, even during the negotiations for the Tripartite Pact.

or know of, the nature of the personal relationship between MATSUOKA and SHIRATORI?

"A. I occasionally got the impression of a certain mistrust between MATSUOKA and SHIRATORI by some remarks they made to me about each other.

"Q. Do you mean by that, General, that both MATSUOKA and SHIRATORI were critical of each other during private conversations with you?

"A. Yes, that I mean.

1940, being another of your cables to your Foreign Office. I call your attention specifically to paragraph 2 which reads as follows: 'With the aim of further preparation of suitable action for the adjustment of state affairs on an authoritarian model, the Government had formed a commission of 24 leading personalities. Ambassador SHIRATORI was appointed the representative for foreign political

11

12

9

10

13

14 15

> 17 18

16

19 20

21

23 24

matters in the Commission. The Commission consists mostly of followers of the reform movement and of the policy of co-operation with the Axis Powers which is constantly demanded by this movement.'

"(Copy handed to Witness.)

"Where did you get this information?

"A. By that time there were various rumours about interior measures taken by the new Cabinet. The reported formation of a commission was one of these rumours.

who else comprised this Commission?

"1. No, I was never informed in that way.

you ever hear again of such a commission or of any of its activities?

"A. No, I have to consider that information reported by me was erroneous.

record page 6,429 to 6,431, "dated 31st January 1941, to the Reich Foreign Minister, wherein the third paragraph states as follows: 'In contrast to this, activistic circles demand preventive attack on Singapore as the key position in the West Pacific Ocean. They expect to deprive America by a surprise

.

action of the possibility of military warfare in the Pacific Ocean or to render it difficult. This minority group is under the leadership of Admiral SUETSUGU, Ambassador SHIRATORI, and has the support of the young officers' corps and individual high leaders of the Army and Navy. "(Copy handed to witness.) "Then by a 'preventive attack' on Singapore, 9 it was the idea that, by so doing, it would preclude 10 America from entering the Pacific War, or at least 11 make it more difficult for her to do so. Is that correct? "A. I was informed that was the idea. 13 "Q. Where did you get all this information? 14 "A. I got this information during the month of January, 1941, from different members of the German Embassy, and from a number of Japanese of various kinds with whom I had private talks. As the 18 report points out in the first paragraph, it was a time of heightened political tension, therefore a 20 lot of sharp political discussions were going on. "(. Were these talks considered official 22 24 in any way? "A. No, they were private talks. "Q. Were you ever afforded any proof of 25

SHIR TORI being a leader among such a group?

".. I was not afforded such a proof.

"(. Then this information is without basis of fact. Is that correct?

"/.. Yes."

r 24 ,

1

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

ACTING PRESIDENT: I think that is a question that has been objected to.

MR. SANDUSKY: If it please the Tribunal, I have an objection to --

MR. CAUDLE: Your Honor, I am sorry that I got ahead, but on his list he gave me, he had the third question on page 25, which is the next question I had marked for his objection. I am sorry I proceeded without waiting.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We will hear your objection.

MR. SANDUSKY: Mr. President, objection is made to the second question on page 25, the one just read by counsel, because this question not only improperly invites a conclusion of the witness, but it suggests to the witness a conclusion that is a non sequitur. In answer to the preceding question, the witness made the negative statement that he had no 24 proof of a particular fact. Now, we submit, it is illogical and improper to ask the witness to conclude as a positive matter, therefore, that such fact does

SHIRATORI being a leader among such a group?

"A. I was not afforded such a proof.

"4. Then this information is without basis of fact. Is that correct?

"/.. Yes."

ACTING PRESIDENT: I think that is a question that has been objected to.

MR. SANDUSKY: If it please the Tribunal, I have an objection to --

MR. CAUDLE: Your Honor, I am sorry that I got ahead, but on his list he gave me, he had the third question on page 25, which is the next question I had marked for his objection. I am sorry I proceeded without waiting.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We will hear your objection.

MR. SANDUSKY: Mr. President, objection is made to the second question on page 25, the one just read by counsel, because this question not only improperly invites a conclusion of the witness, but it suggests to the witness a conclusion that is a non sequitur. In answer to the preceding question, the witness made the negative statement that he had no proof of a particular fact. Now, we submit, it is illogical and improper to ask the witness to conclude as a positive matter, therefore, that such fact does

...

not exist.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is sustained and the answer, as read, will be stricken.

MR. CAUDLE: Your Honor, will you hear me a minute?

ACTING PRESIDENT: All right, go ahead.

MR. CAUDLE: This question was asked relative to a definite statement contained in a telegram that was composed, written, and otherwise dispatched by the interrogator -- I mean, the one being interrogated, namely, General Ott, and certainly if he made a definite statement he should certainly be permitted to say where he got the information. If he didn't get it and didn't know it was a fact, he certainly should be permitted to say he did not know it to be a fact -- was not correct.

Further, sir, this telegram was dispatched,
I think, in January of '40 -- no, wait a minute -the 31st of January, 1941. Over this period of
years, when I asked him this question in May of 1947,
he hedemple opportunity to know at that time that it
was not a fact.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is sustained and the answer will be stricken.

1 2

 MR. CAUDLE: Have you any objection?

ACTING PRESIDENT: I think the next question is objected to also.

MR. CAUDLE (Reading continued):

"Q. I now hand you copy of exhibit No.

1073," record page 9,909 to 9,913, "dated 18th May

1941, another of your communications to your Foreign

Minister.

"(Copy handed to witness.)

"General, you state in the last sentence of this communication that the Activist Group is at present weakened by the serious illness of SHIRATORI, yet in response to my questions on exhibit No. 562," record page 6,429 to 6,431, "you state that you had no proof of SHIRATORI being a leader of the Activist Group, and finally concluded that information you had to this effect was without basis of fact. Is that correct?"

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Sandusky.

MR. SANDUSKY: Mr. President, I object to this question, or rather, statement by counsel, because it is based upon the improper conclusion suggested by counsel in the preceding question. I refer particularly to the last three lines of the question. We urge its rejection for the same reason.

MR. CAUDLE: If it please your Honors, I prefaced that question by those remarks just to refresh his recollection of what had transpired in the other questions asked prior to this one, and it certainly was only to clarify the matter that I brought it up at that time.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is sustained.

MR. CAUDLE (Reading continued):

"Q. General, I now hand you exhibit No.

1113," record page 10,157 to 10,158, "dated 7th July

1941, which is another communication to your Foreign

Minister.

"(Copy handed to witness.)

"Please read this carefully before answer-

"Where was SHIP/.TORI residing at the time of this visit?"

Your Honor, for your information, that is a telegram where he reports visiting SHIRATORI, who was ill at that time and not in Tokyo.

"A. SHIRATORI was residing at Hayama which is a seaside resort about two hours drive from Tokyo.

"Q. Was this visit of a special nature?

"A. No. I went many times in the summer

9

7

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

to the seaside near Hayama where I had my own yilla, as many Foreign diplomats had. On one of these occasions I visited SHIRATORI. The way to his residence was a circuit of just five minutes on the way to my own villa.

"Q. It appears from your communication that you had been directed by your Foreign Minister to convey to SHIRATORI his best wishes for his recovery.

"A. I think that is correct.

"Q. However, as you stated, you did not make a special trip to this place for this purpose, but chanced to go by during your visit to your own villa. Is that correct?

"A. I think so."

There is another objection to a question.

"Q. At the time you saw SHIRATORI you stated in your communication that he was very ill, and stated at length as to the nature of his illness, as explained to you by him. Did you know at the time of this visit that his real and most serious illness was of a mental nature?"

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Sandusky.

MR. SANDUSKY: Mr. President, objection is made to this question because, we submit, it is

3 4

grossly leading.

MR. CAUDLE: Your Honor, I don't know whether the prosecution could ever entertain enough gall to object to a leading question, with what they got by with in some instances.

Sometimes you have to preface a question to give a man an idea of what you are talking about.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is overruled.

MR. CAUDLE (Reading continued):

Here is another objection.

"A. No, I reported his suffering from kidney trouble, as I had been informed. I found out later, however, that it was really of a mental nature."

"Q. Then the information you received first of the nature of his illness was, to all intents and purposes, an effort to cover up the real nature of the illness, both by him and his friends."

This is off the record.

(Whereupon, Mr. Caudle made a statement off the record.)

"A. I think that this wrong information was mainly due to the well-known shyness of the Japanese with regard to giving any particulars of their personal conditions.

T	"(. From your observations what was his
1	mental condition at this time?
2	"A. At this time he gave me the impression
3	of being mentally tired.
4	"Q. I now hand you copy of exhibit No. 800,"
5	record page 7,967 to 7,968, "dated 1st August 1941,
6	which I ask you to read carefully. With whom was
7	this conversation that you reported?
8	"(Copy handed to witness.)
9	
10	"A. I held this conversation with Minister
11	Secretary YAMAMOTO, commissioned with the affairs of
12	the Vice-Foreign Minister.
13	"Q. Was SHIRATORI present at this time?
14	"A. No. I pointed out in this report that
15	I had visited SHIRATORI during the past days in his
16	place of convalescence, and as far as I know, he was
17	still there at this time.
18	"Q. Was this a special visit or another
19	visit similar to the previous one?
20	"A. It was another visit similar to the
21	
22	previous one.
23	. "Q. Did any of the ideas advanced by
24	YAMAMOTO ever materialize?
25	"A. Insofar as I know, they did not.
	"Q. I now hand you copy of exhibit No. 608,"

2 3 4

record page 6,662 to 6,665, "dated 5th December 1941, being another cable from you to your Foreign Office, the fourth paragraph of which reads as follows:

'SHIRATORI explained to me that the leading circles of Japan have come to the conclusion that Roosevelt wants now to enter the war by means of a conflict in the Far East. From various sides the opinion has been advocated that the United States are now sure of the coalition of the ABCD States and Russia which has been striven for more than ten years.

Therefore Roosevelt believes that the moment for a settlement has come since one cannot be certain of the adherence of these states in the future.'

"(Copy handed to witness.)

"This paragraph appears to me to be a little confusing as to whether or not SHIRATORI gave all the expressions contained therein. Will you please state whether or not the entire paragraph relates to SHIRATORI, and if not, state what part of the same does relate to him.

"A. Only the first sentence refers to SHIRATORI.

"Q. Do you recall where you saw SHIRATORI at this time?

"A. I do not recall that.

```
Is it possible that it was another
                "Q.
     visit to his seaside villa?
2
                    It is possible.
                "h.
 3
.4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
```

Is it possible that it was another "Q. visit to his seaside villa? It is possible. "h.

.

1

2

3 4

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

This question will be objected to.

He waives it.

(Reading continued):

Did you consider at this time and did you report to your Government that you thought SHIRATORI had recovered from this mental illness?

"A He still appeared to be in a state of convalescence, and I do not think I reported to my Government that he had recovered, at this time or before.

Under these circumstances, and particular-"Q ly as he occupied no position whatsoever with the Government at that time, did you consider that he meant to convey to you that 'leading circles' meant the official attitude of the Government?"

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Sandusky.

MR. SANDUSKY: Mr. President, objection is made to this question. SHIRATORI's collaboration with the German Embassy is a point in issue, but we submit that Mr. Ott's interpretation of information furnished by SHIRATORI is irrelevant and immaterial.

MR. CAUDLE: If it please the Court, if the prosecution will adopt an attitude like that with reference to all these other communications, I wouldn't have to be reading this interrogation.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained.

MR. CAUDLE: (Reading continued)

General, in going through these various exhibits, I find that one of the same, namely exhibit No. 576," record page 6476 to 6480, "dated 25th March 1941, being your 'Note on situation in Japan', sent from a train in Germany to the Reich's Foreign Minister, wherein you digressed on a proposed attack by Japan upon Singapore, was inadvertently not placed chronologically with the other exhibits. With your permission, I will question you as to this document now.

"(Copy handed to Witness.)

"You state in this exhibit, 'Ambassador SHIRATORI stressed also the necessity to tie up the British Fleet. Is it correct, as I have stated, that this note was sent while you were in Germany?

> "A Yes.

What was the occasion of your being in 110 Germany at this time?

I was called by my Government to be present during the visit of Japanese Foreign Minister MATSUOKA to Berlin.

Where was SHIRATORI at this time? 110

SHIRATORI was in Japan. II A

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

Please state where, when, and the circumstances of your meeting and conversation with him in this regard.

I met him some time, probably in February "A 1941, during a farewell visit before I left for Germany.

Was this meeting of an official nature? 110 No, it was not of an official nature, "A but purely personal.

Is it not true that SHIRATORI was a "Q career diplomat, and at no time saw any service either in the Japanese Army or Navy?

As far as I know, that is correct.

Then the opinion expressed by him was 11Q only that of a layman, and not the opinion of a man versed in military tactics. Is that correct?

That is correct. The same opinion had "A been voiced to me during that period by other laymen.

General, I hand you a copy of exhibit No. 1272," record page 11351 to 11358, "dated 17th May 1942, which is a communication to your Government recommending various German decorations. Will you please describe or explain the German protocol in awarding decorations to foreign nationals, and the circumstances surrounding this recommendation. (Copy

handed to Witness.)

For awarding German decorations the "A recommendations had to be made to Hitler by his Chancellory, which got the proposals from the various Reich Ministries, as the Foreign Ministry, War Ministry, etc. Minister von Ribbentrop was, for himself and for his personal favourites, rather anxious to get foreign decorations, and became very angry when he considered the Japanese Government too reluctant in bestowing a sufficient number of decorations upon German people. He succeeded in blocking in the Reich Government every award of decorations for Japanese for a considerable time. Consequently the Japanese side became very insistent, and stressed the striking contrast with the Italian practice, where there was a sumptuous flow of decorations.

"In order to break this deadlock troubling the atmosphere in Tokyo, I eventually presented to Ribbentrop a list wherein I recommended decorations to be bestowed on the second anniversary of the Tripartite Pact in September 1942.

"Q From what you say, it would appear that officials of both Governments were jealous of their respective departments, and there was somewhat of a contest as to who could get the most decorations or

•

10

2

12

14 15

16

17

18

20

21

22 23

24

medals to add to already crowded tunics.

"A Yes, it was proved from my own experience.

"Q Please explain the circumstances of your recommendation of SHIRATORI for the Great Cross, the German decoration.

"A The German Protocol had provided that
the Great Cross is the only class of decoration for
which a person of Ambassador's rank is eligible. As
this fact was well known to the Japanese Board of
Decorations, the bestowal of a lesser decoration would
have been considered by the Japanese side principally
as most unfavourable, as my long experience proved.
I recommended SHIRATORI on this occasion of a decorations
list for the Tripartite Pact because he was personally
known to Ribbentrop, and had been the Adviser to the
Foreign Minister at the time of the conclusion of the
pact, in order to lessen the opposition of the Reich's
Foreign Minister against the whole matter of decorations.

"Q General, from later developments do you think that the efforts of SHIRATORI, and particularly the results of such efforts to further Japanese-German relations, deserved the award given to him?

"A I am sorry, but I must say that I do not think so.

"Q Were other recommendations made for awards

in commemoration of the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact, and were such awards bestowed?

MATSUOKA had been decorated previously. Mr. SAITO,
Yoshie, another Adviser to MATSUOKA during the
negotiations for the Tripartite Pact, had been
recommended and decorated at the same time as SHIRATORI
with the Great Cross. I think that there were others
but I do not recall their names.

"Q What was the usual procedure of the Japanese with regard to these people designated or recommended for consideration of awards by them?

"A When we discussed with the Japanese side confidentially before recommendations went to the Reich Government, they usually suggested the distribution of decorations among higher ranking personalities and some of lesser rank in order not to create dissatisfaction.

defense counsel, Mr. James N. Freeman, counsel for General Kenryo SATO, asked me to inquire about the circumstances of your recommendation of General SATO for the German award of the Distinguished Service cross with Stars. Will you please state why and under what circumstances this recommendation was made.

end others was made by the German Military Attache
upon the insistence of the Japanese Army, which had
become rather angry because no award of German
decorations had been given for a considerable time.

I backed the recommendation of General SATO due to his
official position. He was, at that time of our common
war, the Chief of the Section of the Japanese Army
where the liaison with the German Embassy was centered."
There will be an objection to this next one.

aforesaid communications sent by, or received byyou, to or from your Government, wherein the name of SHIRATORI was mentioned, numbering about 16 to 18.

From these communications the prosecution has endeavoured to show the important position of SHIRATORI in the Japanese Government, and the influence he had on its policies. These wires covered a period of from April 1939 to May 1942, approximately three years. During this period will you please state approximately how many communications you sent from Tokyo to your Government."

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Sandusky.

MR. SANDUSKY: Mr. President, my next objection actually is addressed to the series of questions beginning

with this particular question. It ends with the second question on the middle of the next page. They all tie into the same subject matter.

In our submission, this attempted evaluation of SHIRATORI's cooperation with Ott on the mathematical basis of the numbers of letters sent or recieved is glaringly irrelevant and immaterial.

K a p e 8 u & K n a p

If it please the Tribunal --MR. CAUDLE: ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Caudle.

MR. CAUDLE: I would venture to say that the gist, or nearly the whole heart of the case against SHIRATORI, they have centered in these telegrams that they have brought back here from Nuremberg that were sent by 7 Ott. And through these telegrams they have tried to 8 emphasize the important position and the influence that 9 the accused SHIRATORI had on Japanese policies and its 10 functions. The prosecution laid particular stress on 11 these 16, 18 or 20 telegrams that they presented in evidence here that contained the name SHIRATORI, whether 13 they came from Berlin or were sent from here.

I think I have a right to show this Tribunal just what an insignificant, infinitesimal part of all the tremendous number of telegrams that were communicated 16 between the two governments, or rather, the Embassy and the German Government -- to show just how little it 19 actually was. When they put those telegrams in evidence 20 they were mighty important at that time; now they want 21 to belittle them and don't want to compare them with the whole number that were sent out of here. I think --ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objec-24

25 tion is sustained. MR. CAUDLE: All right; that's all on that.

14

15

17

"Q During this period approximate-(Reading) ly how many did you receive from your government?" MR. SANDUSKY: Same objection on the same grounds, your Honor. ACTING PRESIDENT: Same ruling. Objection sustained. MR. CAUDLE (reading): "Q Then is it not true 8 that, comparable to the number of those sent and re-9 ceived, SHIRATORI was referred to in an unimportant 10 number of the same?" MR. SANDUSKY: Same objection, your Honor, 11 on the same grounds. 12 ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection 13 14 is sustained. MR. CAUDLE (reading): "Q Did you not mention 15 SHIRATORI's name in some of your telegrams to Berlin 16 17 where the name of some other person would have answered 18 he purpose? 19 "A Yes. 20 "Q The prosecution accuses SHIRATORI of furnishing 21 important information to Germany through your Embassy. 23 Did he ever furnish you with any news or information 24 at all concerning an important policy or decision of 25 his government, or any state secret in general? "A He never furnished any news or information

of this kind to the German Embassy.

"Q Was SHIRATORI in occupation of any important position in Tokyo during the whole of your sojourn in Japan?

"A Not that I know of, during my personal acquaintance with him, except as Advisor to the Foreign linister.

"O Did he appear to you to have any influence in important affairs of state, or to carry any weight with Foreign Minister LATSUOKA in this position?

"A No, as I have pointed out before.

"Q Was his position not rather that of a person in opposition to the government of the day?

"A I heard him several times criticize in a most outspoken manner measures announced by the Japanese Government.

"Q Was he not forward in expressing his personal views?

"A Yes, he appeared sometimes to be a rather talkative man.

"Q From later developments and proven facts and events as you know them now, did SHIRATORI ever, during your acquaintance with him, carry any weight with his government or influence the policies thereof, either fereign or domestic?"

MR. SANDUSKY: Mr. President, objection is made to this question on the ground that it calls for a conclusion beyond the competence of the witness, and is an attempt to forswear the issue.

IR. CAUDLE: If it please the Tribunal, this interrogation is centered around a number of telegrams making definite statements, signed by Eugen Ctt. He was on the scene as a German representative in the country of Japan. He had an opportunity to observe, and as history unfolded itself, he had opportunity to see what happened and know what went on. This is not a forecast; it is an observation that he saw and knew about that has already happened and gone.

If anyone should know, your Honor, then General Ott is the man that does know.

ACTING PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objection is overruled.

MR. CAUDLE (reading): "A During my acquaintance with him in Tokyo, I must say 'No.'

"Q Will you please make a general statement as to your personal relationship with Ribbentrop, and state whether or not such relations had any bearing on your communications to him, and why?

"A The relations between Germany and Japan went up and down several times during the years of my own experience, 1934-1943. When the Japanese Government, in the face of dramatic changes and actions in the German policy, acted in their own way, Ribbentrop reacted often with marked distrust and decision. He had a strong tendency for 'wishful thinking,' and for overlooking the facts and forces upon which the Japanese Government used to base their decisions.

"When I often tried to moderate the views and instructions of Ribbentrop, I awakened a mounting distrust and suspicion that my attitude was influenced by undue consideration of those Japanese tendencies which were either indifferent or opposed to friendly relations between Japan and Germany, and that I had not sufficient contact with other groups of the political Japanese life. I had to presume that this opinion of Ribbentrop would spoil the success of my moderating work, and drive him even more to other sources of information which were more in line with his own ideas.

"In order to avoid such a development, I carried on personal relations with the few Japanese who were personally known to Ribbentrop, and whom I had theretofore been instructed to contact.

"I mentioned these people, among them Ambassader SHIRATORI, and stressed their cooperation on occasions, especially when I tried to give weight to my opinions

*

or suggestions contrasting Ribbentrop's ideas or instructions or when it seemed necessary to confirm him that my report covered the situation from every point of view.

"Q General, was there ever any real cooperation between the German and Japanese Governments in the conduct of the war, as to military and economic operations?

"A No, there was no real cooperation in either respect, particularly compared with the combined strategy and Lend-Lease operations of the Allied Nations. The Tripartite Pact provided for a Commission which did not set to work until Japan had entered the war. Afterwards, in January 1942, an agreement was concluded in Berlin which fixed the respective separate spheres of military operations between Japan, Germany and Italy. In the military field there was only an occasional exchange of blueprints or samples of newly developed weapons or other instruments of warfare and of expert personnel during my presence in Japan.

"In the economic field there was the transport of raw materials to Germany via the Fiberian Railway, and afterwards when this line was stopped by the Russo-German War, by blockade-running German and Italian ships. This transport collapsed, after heavy losses, as far as

3 4

5

6

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

23

24

I heard, about the end of 1943.

15

16

17

"O General, I have been requested by another defense counsel, Mr. William Logan, counsel for Marquis KIDO, the former Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, and also one of the accused, to enquire about the nature of the 6 relations between the Marquis and the German Govern-7 ment. Will you please state whether or not you know the 8 Marquis and what relations in your official capacity did 9 you have with him?

"A I had no relations with him in my official 11 capacity because his official position did not cover any contact with the Foreign Missions. As far as I remember, I met him occasionally during Imperial ceremonies or big social functions of the Japanese Government

"O Will you please state if you know what the attitude of the German Government was towards the Marguis?

"A The attitude of the Reich Government towards 20 21 Marquis KIDO was one of distrust. He was considered as 22 belonging to the group which did not favour the improve-23 ment of the Japanese-German relations, primarily under 24 the leadership of the Minister of the Imperial Household, 25 MATSUDAIRA. I considered KIDO in line with MATSUDAIRA's

views, and this feeling was shared in Berlin.

"Signed, Eugen Ott." Duly verified by Captain Ralph E. Johnson, U. S. Army. ACTING PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes. (Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

Greenberg & Yelden

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Brooks.

MR. BROOKS: If the Tribunal please, in this exhibit, 3579, I wish to submit the answers at the top half of pages 12, 19, 20 and 38 to the Tribunal for consideration as a possible answer to their inquiry made to the President in relation to exhibit 523. Exhibit 521 appeared at record page 6174 and was a telegram sent to Berlin by Ott. Paragraph 22 of exhibit 3375, court record page 32,235, KOISO's affidavit, discusses this exhibit 523.

on the witness stand why Ott would make statements about KOISO as he did in this exhibit 523, which KOISO denied as having been made by himself; and I submit that by adopting these answers on the pages hereinto referred the Tribunal may consider this as a possible answer to their inquiry thereon and as bearing out KOISO's reply that it must have been an attempt to impress the higher officials.

I wish the Tribunal to consider this as evidence on the pages referred to in behalf of KOISO as well as on behalf of SHIRATORI -- these answers.

MR. CAUDLE: Mr. President.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Caudle.

MR. CAUDLE: I next refer to exhibit No. 3577, curriculum vitae of the defendant SHIRATORI, in order to show the following facts: (a) That SHIRATORI arrived at Tokyo December 23, 1936, returning from Stockholm; (b) that he was relieved from the ministerposts in Sweden, Norway, Denmark and Finland, and that he was placed on the waiting list April 28, 1937; (c) that he was appointed as the Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Italy September 22, 1938; (d) that he left Tokyo November 22, 1938, and arrived in Rome on December 29, 1938.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Did you refer to exhibit 3577? I think you mean 3575.

MR. CAUDLE: Yes.

The prosecution stated that SHIRATORI accepted the post of Ambassador to Italy and journeyed to Rome in the latter part of December, 1938, with the expectation that he would succeed in concluding the Tripartite military alliance between Japan, Germany and Italy (record page 16,914; also exhibit 498, record page 6083). In order to contradict this insistence, I call the witness UGAKI, Issei.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: Mr. President, the witness UGAKI is in court. He has previously testified

before the Tribunal.

2

ISSEI UGAKI, recalled as a witness on behalf of the defense, having been previously sworn, testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. CAUDLE:

Q Will you please state your name and address?

A My name is UGAKI, Issei; my address: Nagaoka Izu, Shizuoka Prefecture.

ACTING PRESIDENT: You are warned that you are still on your former oath.

MR. CAUDLE: May the witness be shown defense document No. 2896?

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

- Q Please examine that document and tell us whether or not it is your sworn affidavit.
 - A This is my affidavit without mistake.
 - Q Are the contents of it correct and true?
 - A Yes.

MR. CAUDLE: I offer in evidence defense document No. 2896.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It may be admitted in

3

9

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

34,908

evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 2896 will receive exhibit No. 3580.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3580 and received in evidence.)

MR. CAUDLE: I will now read that exhibit:

"Sworn deposition - Deponent: UGAKI, Issei.

"Having been duly sworn in accordance with
the procedure followed in my country, I do hereby
depose and say as follows:

"1. I was Minister of Foreign Affairs in the first KONOYE Cabinet from May 26 to September 29, 1938.

Premier KONOYE suggested to me the appointment to viceministership of Foreign Affairs of Mr. SHIRATORI, Toshio, who was then on the waiting list as a minister plenipotentiary. While I had no desire to remove the then vice-minister, I thought it a pity to leave Mr. SHIRATORI so long without any assignment. I therefore requested him to call on me and asked him if he would accept the post of Ambassador to Italy. He showed reluctance at first, but consented a few days later. He was formally installed on the 22d of

1 2

7 8

September.

was no part of my consideration to specifically make Mr. SHIRATORI conduct a negotiation looking to strengthening the Anti-Comintern Pact between Japan, Germany and Italy, nor to let him in any way put forth special efforts to induce Italy to participate in such a new agreement. In offering him the Rome post, therefore, no mention whatever, was made of this matter.

"4. As a matter of fact at that time the question of strengthening the Anti-Comintern Pact had been brought to the notice of the Japanese Government merely in the form of information from German quarters. It was by no means a formal overture through the German Ambassador in Tokyo or from the Japanese Ambassador in Berlin, but was conveyed to us by our Military Attache in Berlin as a piece of information. The whole matter was still at a quite unofficial and sounding stage. It is true that the Government decided to launch into a tentative negotiation, but no mature study had yet been made, nor a final conclusion reached at that time. I for myself was of the opinion that the question of strengthening or amplifying the Anti-Comintern Pact

9 4

was one centering upon the prevention of the communistic revolution of the world and that consequently it was a matter solely of what measures should be adopted vis-a-vis the communistic powers of the world. I believed that whether the strengthening or amplifying of the Pact should stop at mutual political assistance or should embrace military assistance as well should be studied on that major premise and determined through negotiation on that general line.

"The problems that lay nearest my heart as Foreign Minister, however, was the solution of the China affair, which, in my opinion, was the most urgent need of the time. That I had accepted the portfolio of Foreign Affairs was in fact mainly for the purpose of tackling this all-important problem. Compared to this, the question of strengthening the Anti-Comintern Pact was a rather minor consideration with me. That is why I did not specifically discuss it with Mr. SHIRATORI in assigning him to Rome.

"5. To the best of my recollection,
Mr. SHIRATORI left Tokyo for Rome some time after I
had resigned as Foreign Minister.

"On this 8 day of May 1947 at Tokyo. "(Signed) UGAKI, Issei."

I think Mr. Blakeney would like to ask some questions.

ACTING . RESIDENT: Mr. Blakeney.

4

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. BLAKENEY: Direct examination on behalf
of Mr. TOGO.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. BLAKENEY:

Q At the time you were Foreign minister in 1938, was the defendant TOGO, Shigenori Ambassador to Germany?

A Yes.

Q And do you remember receiving, as Foreign Minister, any cablegrams from Ambassador TOGO stating his views on the Three Power Alliance among Germany, Japan and Italy which was then under discussion?

A Yes, I remember.

Q And in those messages did Ambassador TOGO approve of or oppose such an alliance?

A I recall that he opposed such an alliance.

Q Did he tell you in those messages, if you remember, that he opposed such an alliance directed against any countries whatsoever?

A Yes, that is my recollection.

MR. BLAKENEY: That is all. Thank you.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Logan.

MR. LOGAN: If the Tribunal please, I wish to ask a few questions on behalf of Marquis KIDO.

1

N. S.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. LOGAN:

Q General, the prosecution in this case, in document 0003, states that Marquis KIDO rejected an appointment suggested by WAKATSUKI of you as the only man who might perhaps have averted war altogether at the meeting of the Senior Statesmen on October 17, 1941. In view of the situation as it existed on October 17 and developed up to December 8, do you agree with the prosecution's claim that you are perhaps the only man who might have averted war?

A I was of the firm belief that a war between Japan and America should be averted by all means. But as to whether, if I had assumed office at that time, I would have been able to do anything about it, I must leave that up to your judgment.

MR. LOGAN: That's all.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Is there any crossexamination?

MR. SANDUSKY: May it please the Tribunal.
ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Sandusky.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. SANDUSKY:

affidavit that no final decisions regarding the proposed pact had been reached by the time of your resignation as Foreign Minister in September, 1938, is it not a fact that Germany had already been advised, at least informally, that Japan could not agree to a pact calling for immediate participation in war or to a pact having no limitations as to its scope or the opposing parties?

ACTING PRESIDENT: Do you understand that long question?

THE WITNESS: I did.

A I had no knowledge as to whether Germany was informed informally of such views. During my tenure of office, all I learned was through the military that Germany desired a general military alliance. I disposed of that matter as information and did not do anything about it. The matter had not advanced to such a stage where we could carry on international negotiations officially.

Q Mr. Witness, in addition to Prince KONOYE's recommendation of SHIRATORI mentioned in your affi-davit, were you not subjected to pressure from other

34,915

2

3

6

quarters to appoint SHIRATORI as your Vice Foreign Minister? MR. CAUDLE: I object to that, your Honor, because he did not appoint him as Vice Foreign Minister. ACTING PRESIDENT: Objection overruled. Q (Continuing) Will you answer the question? I did hear rumors to that effect, but no one approached me directly on the matter other than Prince KONOYE. 10 May I refresh your recollection, Mr. UGAKI? 12 In July, 1938 is it not a fact that the late OKAWA, 13 Shumei presented a petition to you signed by a group 14 of younger officials in the Foreign Office urging the appointment of SHIRATORI as Vice Foreign Minister? 15 LR. CAUDLE: I object to that, your Honor, 16 17 as being immaterial and irrelevant. 18 ACTING PRESIDENT: Objection overruled. 19 (Continuing) Would you answer the question, witness? 21 I have no recollection as to whether I did receive such a petition or not. 23 May I refresh your recollection further, Mr. UGAKI? Is it not true that around June of 1938 you

20

22

24

complained to Premier KONOYE that War Minister ITAGAKI

2

3

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

was most persistent in pressing for the appointment of SHIRATORI as Vice Foreign Minister?

A I have no such recollection.

Q Mr. UGAKI, did you learn from any source that after your resignation as Foreign Minister fifty young officials of the Foreign Office again presented a petition on behalf of SHIRATORI, this time to Premier KONOYE and this time urging SHIRATORI's appointment as Foreign Minister?

MR. CAUDLE: I certainly object to that question because what he heard is certainly not competent in this court. I have no objection to him testifying to what he knows, but hearsay is, in my understanding, not competent.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Hearsay is competent under our Charter. Objection overruled.

Q (Continuing) Would you answer the question?

A I didn't even hear rumors to such an effect.

Q It is correct, is it not, Mr. UGAKI, that seven days after Mr. SHIRATORI was appointed Ambassador to Italy you were succeeded as Foreign Minister by Premier Prince KONOYE who had previously recommended the appointment of SHIRATORI?

A That is true.

MR. SANDUSKY: May it please the Tribunal,

16 17

> 18 19

21

22

24

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Morse & Whalen

that concludes my cross-examination.

ACTING PRESIDENT: I have a question by a Member of the Tribunal:

When you say that you have no recollection of OKAWA's demands, do you mean that no such demands were made?

THE WITNESS: That is what I meant.

MR. CAUDLE: May I ask just one question please,

sir?

General UGAKI, in line with the last question propounded to you by Mr. Sandusky with reference to Prince KONOYE being appointed Premier within six days after the appointment of SHIRATORI as Ambassador to Italy, by the same token is it not true that within three days upon his arrival in Rome the said KONOYE Cabinet fell?

THE WITNESS: Maybe so. I don't exactly recall the dates.

MR. CAUDLE: Did not that cabinet fall in the very earliest part of January, 1939?

THE WITNESS: Yes, as you say.

MR. CAUDLE: That is all. I ask that the witness be released if there are no further questions.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The witness may be excused under the usual conditions.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

MR. CAUDLE: Item 18 has been deleted.

The prosecution insisted that prior to the arrival of SHIRATORI at Rome both Ribbentron and OSHIMA had failed in their efforts to bring Italy into agreement for a Tripartite Alliance (record page 16,914).

But I will show that SHIRATORI had nothing to do with the acceptance by Mussolini of Ribbentrop's proposal to transform the Anti-Comintern Pact into an alliance. First, I offer in evidence defense document No. 640, a telegram sent by Ambassador SHIRATORI at Rome to Fereign Minister ARITA, 10 January 1939.

ACTING PRISIDENT: It may be admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 640 will receive exhibit No. 3581.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3581 and received in evidence.)

MR. CAUDLE: I will now read exhibit No. 3581: "Despatached from Rome, January 10, p.m.

"Received at the Foreign Office January 11,a.m.

"To: Foreign Hinister ARITA

"From: Ambassador SHIRATORI

"No. 3.

"I presented credentials on the morning of

3

6

9

10 11

12

13

14

16 17

18

20

21

2324

January 10. The particulars will be given by post."

I neglected to read the date: "Showa 14 (1939) at the top of that page of the exhibit.

I next offer in evidence defense document No. 275, a confidential note sent by Ambassador SHIRATORI at Rome to Foreign Minister ARITA under date of January 19, 1939, in order to show dates of SHIRATORI's arrival in Rome, his call on Foreign Minister Ciano, and his presentation of credentials to the King.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document No. 275 will receive exhibit No. 3582.

("hereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3582 and received in evidence.)

MR. CAUDLE: I will read this document only in part as is pertinent, down through the sixth line of the second page:

"January 19th, 1939 (the 14th year of Showa)

c "Subject: Report concerning the Presentation
of Credentials.

"To: Mr. ARITA, Hachiro, Foreign Minister.

"From: SHIRATORI, Toshio, Envoy Extraordinary and Ambassador Plenipotentiary to Italy.

3 4

1

7

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

> 17 18

> 19

20

21

23

24

"I report as follows on the above-mentioned subject:

"I arrived at my post on 29th December last year. On the 31st of the same month, informally paying an inaugural call to Foreign Minister Ciano, I handed to him the copies of my credentials and the letter of recall of former Ambassador HOTTA and asked him to arrange for me an audience with the King in order that I might present them, while I requested the Chief Chamberlain to inform me of the convenience of the Court. On 9th January, a chamberlain formally called and informed me that it had been decided that the ceremony of the presentation of the credentials would be held on the 10th at 11:00 a.m. On the said day, therefore, after 14 the chamberlain who was sent to guide me had arrived, I started for the Royal Palace attended by the members of the Embassy staff, the military and naval officers, their assistants and the flight officer, -- riding in 18 four coaches sent round from the Court. Arriving at 19 the Palace we passed through the inner garden of the 20 Palace and the court-rooms where the guards of honour 21 were lined up, and entering the antechamber, we ex-22 changed courtesies with the court officials and the 23 military aide-de-camp to the King who were ewaiting our arrival. Led by the Vice-Chief Chamberlain, I entered

24

3

11

12

13

15

17

the audience-chamber and presented the credentials and the letter of recall. (There was no attendance on the King)" In order to show that Mussolini decided to participate in a tripartite alliance on the 1st of 6 January, 1939, (that is, on the third day after SHIRATORI's arrival in Rome) I offer in evidence defense 8 document No. 556, which is an English translation of 9 excerpts from Ciano's Diary, exhibit No. 499 (IPS document No. 1418). I offer in evidence and read only the marked parts thereof for the purpose of saving time. ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in 12 13 evidence. CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 556 14 will receive exhibit No. 3583. 15 (Whereupon, the document above re-16 17 ferred to was marked defense exhibit No. 18 3583 and received in evidence.) 19 MR. CAUDLE: I might add, your Honor, that 20 the certificate of procurement of its authenticity covers both this document and defense document 1619. 22 (Reading) "Excerpts from Ciana Diary. 23 "January 1, 1939." 24 I read the first sentence in the first para-25 greph:

"The duce returned to Rome yesterday evening and we had a long conversation."

Now the third paragraph, first sentence, same

"Finally, he informs me about his decision to accept Ribbentrop's proposal to transform the anti-Comintern Pact into an alliance. He wishes the alliance to be signed during the last third of January."

I now go to the last sentence of that paragraph, same date:

"I write Ribbentrop the letter in which I inform him of our acceptance of his proposal (inserted in the body of the documents)."

"Jenuary 2, 1940 (sic)

Tomorrow I will transmit it to Attolice, together with some instructions concerning what he is to say to the Germans in connection with the Alto Adige and the commercial relations between our two countries. Concerning the alto Adige, it would fall in with Hitler's plans to permit the departure of those Germans who want to leave. I telephone Ribbentrop to inform him briefly of this decision. The connection was bad and it was difficult to understand each other. We were not able to say much. But he was satisfied and confirmed that by

I now read the first two sentences of January 3, 1939.

"I give Attolico instructions on his mission to Ribbentrop; he is leaving this evening. While before I always found him to be rather hostile to the idea of an alliance with Germany, this morning he was openly in favor of it."

I skip the next sentence and read,

"In the afternoon I also inform von Mackensen who, returning from a trip to Berlin, came to pay me a visit."

And then I go to page 3 of the document and read the first sentence under January 5, 1939.

"After a first conversation with Ribbentrop,
Attolico reports that Ribbentrop proposes the 28 of
January as the date for the conclusion of the alliance."

I go to page 4, the first sentence at the top of the page, still under the date of January 5.

"Il Duce has told me that he has informed the King of the coming military alliance with Germany. He showed himself satisfied."

The entry of the diary for 2 April 1939 will be read afterwards, for the purpose of securing an orderly testimony.

ACTING PRESIDENT: On page 1 for January 2,

it is dated 1940. Isn't that a mistake?

IMR. CAUDLE: That is a typographical error.

I didn't notice it. It is supposed to be 1939.

ACTING PRESIDENT: You have the word "sic" in parenthesis. Is that the way it is on the original entry?

Mr. CAUDLE: It seems that in the diary itself there was a typographical error and it had 1940 following right after January 1, 1939. And the word "sic" was stuck in: the diary; why it was there I don't know.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Did you intend to offer this defense document 556-A and defense document 1619-A, Certificate of Origin?

MR. CAUDIE: It was supposed to have been attached to both those two documents. I did not have a separate document for -- I mean a separate certificate for each document, and I called it to the Court's attention when I first began.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It should be introduced and given a number.

MH. CAUDLE: All right, sir. I had assumed that it would be part of those two exhibits.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 556-A and defense document 1619-A will receive exhibit No. 3583-A.

(Whereupon, the documents above re-

ferred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3583-A.)

MR. CAUDLE: I next offer in evidence defense document No. 852, a memorandum of German Ambassador Mackensen at Rome, under date of 3 January 1939, in order to show that Ciano informed him of the Italian decision to accept Ribbentrop's proposal to transform the Anti-Comintern Pack into an alliance.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 852 will receive exhibit No. 3584.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3584 and received in evidence.)

MR. CAUDLE: (Reading) "Memorandum of Mackensen, German Ambassador at Rome, 3 January 1939.

"Count Ciano informed me in the strictest confidence in the course of our conversation today that the Duce has decided, on the question of the Germany-Italy-Japan Tripartite Alliance Pact, that the signing can take place immediately as far as he is concerned. He - Ciano - (supplementing a brief telephone notification last night) has written the German Foreign Minister a private letter concerning this, which Attolico, who

23 24

1

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

is returning to Berlin tonight, is to take to him. In view of other already existing commitments in January (Chamberlain visit, trip to Belgrade, 2-3 days thereafter to devote himself to affairs here in Rome) a day at the end of the month comes under consideration. The German Foreign Minister considers this also practical, because the technical preparations by the Japanese for the signing ceremony will take about 3 weeks. OSHIMA will sign for Japan. He, Ciano, has gladly acceded to the desire of Herr von Ribbentrop and agreed to the choice of Berlin as the place for signing. Count 10 Ciano then took up the calendar and said the 30th, or 11 even better the 28th, would be suitable signing days 12 for him. He has learned from Attolico that a major 13 address by the Fuehrer is planned for the 31st. 14 15

"Rome, 3 January 1939.

"Signed, Mackensen."

I next offer in evidence defense document No. 1619, which is also an English translation of excerpts from "Ciano Diary," exhibit No. 499, IPS document No. 1418, in order to show that Mussolini, notwithstanding ShikaTORI's activities, preferred an Italo-German alliance to a tripartite alliance.

I offer in evidence this document, and will read only the marked parts thereof for the purpose of

23

22

16

17

18

19

20

saving time.

1

2

3

4

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ACTING PRESIDENT: Admitted in evidence.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1619

will receive exhibit No. 3585.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3585 and received in evidence.)

MR. CAUDLE: (Reading) "Excerpts from Count Ciano's Diary. From IPS document No. 1418, exhibit No. 499.

"February 3, 1939

"The Duce is discontented with the Japanese delays in concluding the Tripartite Alliance and regrets the way in which Ribbentrop lightly assumes that the Tokyo Government will agree to conclude the pact.

Mussolini thinks it might be a good idea to conclude a double alliance, without Japan, and leave Japan to face Anglo-French force alone. In this case, the pact would have no anti-British or anti-American flavor what-soever."

I now go to the item of March 3d, 1939, starting at the third line thereof, second paragraph.

"The Duce is at Terminillo. He telephones that he would like to see me; in the afternoon I go to him."

.

.

22

24

We turn next to the back of that page, and right at the end of the third line, under the same date, we read:

New delays are caused by Japanese red tape and formality. The Duce is always more in favor of the bilateral alliance with Berlin, leaving Tokyo out. Our
alliance with Japan will push the United States into
the arms of the western democracies once and for all.
He wents to speed up the German-Italian alliance."

I now drop down to the item under April 25,

"News arrives from Berlin that the Japanese persist in their reservations with respect to the triple alliance; therefore the signing is postponed sine die. Mussolini, to whom I telephone the news at Forli, where he has been since this morning, says that he is just as glad; actually for some time he has considered Japan's adherence more harmful than useful. We will meet kibbentrop on the 6th, in some North Italian city, to define the common policy."

I now go to the item dated May 6 and 7, 1939. It will be in the second paragraph on page 3 of the document, first line.

"I took notes of the conversations with

. 5

Ribbentrop."

I now drop to the next paragraph.

"The alliance, or rather the immediate announcement of the alliance, was decided Saturday evening right after dinner at the Continental, following a telephone call from the Duce. After the talk, I reported to Mussolini the results, satisfying from our point of view. He, as always when he has achieved something, demands more, and asked me to have the Bilateral Pact announced, which he has always preferred to the Triangular Alliance. Ribbentrop, who, at the bettom of his heart, has always aimed at the inclusion of Japan in the pact, at first demurred but then ended by giving in with the reservation that he must obtain Hitler's approval. The latter, called on the telephone, gave his immediate approval and personally helped with the editing of the communique. When I informed the Duce on Sunday morning he displayed particular satisfaction."

The prosecution offered in evidence against Shikatoki exerpts from "Ciano Diary," exhibit No. 499-A, IPS document 1418-B, entry for 7 January 1939, and exhibit No. 501, IPS document 1418-D, entries for 6 February, 6 March and 8 March, 1939, record pages 6095-6097. These entries reflect only Ciano's

12 13 14

4

7

9

10

11

15

17 18

19

20

22

24

one-sided viewpoint. The best evidence of SHIRATORI's official acts and advices to his government would be the telegraphic reports which SHIRATORI sent from Rome at that time as Japanese Ambassador to Italy. But neither the prosecution nor the defense can offer them because these telegrams were destroyed by fire and exist no more. To show this fact I offer in evidence defense document No. 1697.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be admitted.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Defense document 1697

will receive exhibit No. 3586.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked defense exhibit No. 3586 and received in evidence.)

MR. CAUDLE: (Reading) "Certificate.

"I, HAYASHI, Kaoru, Chief of Archives
Section, Japanese Foreign Office, hereby certify that
all the copies of telegrams, which were exchanged between the Japanese Foreign Office and Mr. SHIRATOHI,
Toshio, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
to Italy, and which concerned the negotiations for
concluding a tripartite pact, were destroyed by fire,
excepting the telegram No. 3, dated January 10, 1939,
sent by Ambassador SHIRATOHI to Foreign Minister
ARITA, and that they are no more in the custody of

)

.5

this Archives Section.

"Signed at Tokyo on this 5th day of May, 1947.
"Signed, HAYASHI Kaoru (Seal)

"The above signature and seal were affixed in the presence of this witness, on the same date and at the same place.

"Witness: (Signed) URABE Katsuma (Seal)"
Items 29 and 30 have been deleted.

The prosecution insisted that SHIRATORI and OSHIMA advocated an all-out military alliance without reservations -- this is going to be just a wee bit long, and I would hate to have to start off in the middle of it in the morning.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until nine-thirty tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Wednesday, 10 December 1947, at 0930.)